

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

Price 23s. net. Yearly subscription 35s. net, post free. Combined yearly subscription for the
CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 60s. net, post free

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

| | |
|---|--|
| Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman) | } <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i> |
| Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.) | |
| F. H. Sandbach, M.A. | |
| Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A. | |
| Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.) | |
| A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society | |
| M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society | |

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series *Volume VI, Nos. 3, 4* *December 1956*

CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A note on Alcaeus fr. 129 | A. J. BEATTIE 189 |
| ὑποκρητής | D. L. PAGE 191 |
| Vitruvius' water-mill | L. A. MORITZ 193 |
| Quid do ut (ne) | C. J. MORSE 196 |
| Otior | D. M. JONES 198 |
| Athenaeus viii. 332 c | D. A. REES 199 |
| (H)abronichos | A. E. RAUBITSCHKE 199 |
| How Antileon's Tyranny ended | P. MAAS 200 |
| Hyacinthus again | T. J. HAARHOFF 200 |
| Juvenal's other elephants | E. LAUGHTON 201 |

REVIEWS:

Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens (Fränkel), J. TATE, 202; *Het homerisch Epos als orale Schöpfung van een Dichter-Hetaïrie* (Suys-Reitsma); *Homer and his Forerunners* (Bowra); *The Landfalls of Odysseus* (Pocock), J. A. DAVISON, 205; *Il poema d'Ulisse* (Stella); *The Homeric Odyssey* (Page), J. A. DAVISON, 207; *Fragments of Unknown Greek Tragic Texts with Musical Notation* (Eitrem, Amundsen, Winnington-Ingram), E. K. BORTHWICK, 211; *Die Stichomythie in der frühen griechischen Tragödie* (Jens), P. T. STEVENS, 213; *Agathon* (Lévéque), D. MERVYN JONES, 215; *The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus* (Simutny), M. PLATNAUER, 216; *Thucydide, vi, vii* (Bodin, de Romilly), K. J. DOVER, 218; *Die Urkunden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides* (Meyer), A. W. GOMME, 220; *Plato's Phaedo* (Bluck), J. TATE, 221; *Aristotelis fragmenta selecta* (Ross), D. J. ALLAN, 224; *Aristotle, Parva Naturalia* (Ross), D. J. FURLEY, 225; *Commentatio de vocis quae est φωνή vi atque usu* (Holwerda), J. TATE, 228; *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon* (Vilborg), R. M. RATTENBURY, 229; *The Hibeh Papyri, ii* (Turner, Lenger), B. R. REES, 233; *Papyri Michaelidae* (Crawford), B. R. REES, 234; *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch, 1-3*, (Frisk), D. M. JONES, 236; *Fabularum Atellanarum fragmenta* (Frassinetti), E. W. HANDLEY, 239; *Die Plautusprologe* (Abel), E. W. HANDLEY, 240; *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Iugurthinum* (Vretska), D. A. MALCOLM, 242; *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta* (Malcovati), R. BROWNING, 244; *Ciceronis Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem, ad Brutum* (Moricca), W. S. WATT, 245; *Plîne, Histoire Naturelle, ix* (Saint-Denis), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 247; *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* (Amatucci), F. J. E. RABY, 249; *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Latinität* (Lundström), D. R. BRADLEY, 250; *Einführung ins Vulgarlatein* (Vossler); *Aufgaben und Methoden der modernen vulgärlateinischen Forschung* (Schmeck), R. BROWNING, 252; *Römische Metrik* (Rubenbauer), M. PLATNAUER, 254;

[Continued on p. 3 of cover]

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME VI NO. 3-4
(VOLUME LXIX OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1956

A NOTE ON ALCAEUS FR. 129

ALCAEUS fr. 129 = GI 5-9 (Lobel-Page):

κάπωνύμασσαν ἀντίαν Δία
σέ δ' Αἰολήμαν [κ]υθαλίμαν θεόν
πάντων γενέθλαν, τὸν δὲ τρίτον
τόνδε κεμήλιον ὠνύμασσ[α]ν
Ζόννυσσον ὠμήσαν.

8 τόνδε κεμήλιονωνύ pap. 2165 fort. τὸν δὲ κεμ dividendum marg. schol. pap. 2166
(c) 6]κεμήλιον

Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, p. 164, remarks that *P. Oxy.* 2165 writes τόνδε-κεμήλιον, while 2166 (c) 6 has in the margin]κεμήλιον; 'it was thus made clear (at least in 2165) that the letters should be divided τόνδε κεμήλιον.' *Κεμήλιον*, he suggests, was a cult-name of Dionysus at the sanctuary described in the poem; but the term is unexplained. On τόνδε he remarks: 'perhaps we should infer that Alcaeus represents himself as confronting the god, or his statue, in his temple at the moment of speaking—"and the third, *this* one, they entitled etc.'" The address to the second of the three deities in the vocative case . . . is in harmony.' For epiphanies see also Page, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 f.

To me it appears unlikely that Alcaeus *represents himself* as confronting either god or statue. In the rest of the poem he is by no means evident. The Lesbian exiles built a shrine (1-4); they prayed to the gods of the shrine (9 f.). No doubt Alcaeus is to be numbered among those who built and prayed, but he does not, so far as can be judged, play the part of their leader or spokesman. Does the style of ll. 5-9, with their τόνδε and σέ, suggest otherwise?

Τόνδε is surely too careless and familiar to be used of a god or even of his statue in a context such as this. In the *Odyssey*, where gods on occasion move freely among men, the pronoun can be used.¹ But such familiarity has no place in the solemn scene described by Alcaeus. We have to do here with men in dire misfortune, who do not enjoy the company of the gods but are rather forsaken by them. Besides, Alcaeus is surely the last of men to see a god in a temple or to pretend that he had seen one. Even if he were merely to address a statue (which is all that most men know of divine epiphanies), he would use a more reverent and more graceful expression than τόνδε. This pronoun distorts the scene and is wrong.

Is σέ δ' any more plausible than τόνδε? Evidently not. For the 2nd sing. pronoun would be appropriate to this context only if it were qualified by **Hpa* voc., or if some part of the accusative phrase Αἰολήμαν . . . γενέθλαν were

¹ Cf. Homer, *Od.* iii. 377; xxiv. 55.

vocative in form. Without such a qualification, *σέ* is brusque and, like *τόνδε*, lacking in reverence. There would be a way out of this difficulty if Hera were named in the preceding stanza, or if the whole poem were a hymn to Hera. But both these hypotheses are quite fanciful and unlikely. The incongruous quality of *σέ* is emphasized by the prayer *ἄγυτε εὖνοοι κτλ*, which begins without any transitional formula at l. 9; this prayer is addressed to all three deities without distinction, and not to Hera individually.

Finally, is Page right in translating (*ἐπ*-)*ᾠνύμασσαν* by 'entitled'? The content of the poem is as follows:

- (a) Lesbian exiles build three altars.
- (b) They (*ἐπ*-)*ᾠνύμασσαν* three gods.
- (c) They pray to the three gods.

On Page's interpretation the jump from (b) to (c) is very striking; 'they gave the gods their titles—'come (ye gods), listen favourably to our prayer'. Indeed this interpretation may well be thought tolerable only if the verb means both *gave* and *used* the titles; i.e. if the exiles *invoked* the gods. One would in any case suppose the titles, as well as the gods to whom they were attached, to have been older than the exiles. And this supposition may be strengthened if one considers that *Αἰολήϊαν, κυδαλίμαν θεόν* and *πάντων γενέθλαν* are none of them *titles* in the true sense of the term; they are merely descriptive epithets, such as are common in hymns and prayers.

From all these considerations it appears that the stanza ll. 5-9 must be reassessed. It is impossible to base an interpretation directly on the obscure sequence of letters *τόνδεκέμήλιον* or on the superficial harmony between *σέ* and *τόνδε*.

I would suggest first that *ἐπωνύμασσαν* and *ᾠνύμασσαν* mean simply 'invoked'. The three gods, with their surnames, existed long before the events that impelled the exiles to build their sanctuary. The exiles undertook their task in order to win the favour of the trinity and so accelerate their own return to Mytilene. When the precinct and altars were complete, the next step was naturally to *invoke* the gods and *pray* to them for a safe return. Thus the invocation in ll. 5-9 and the prayer that follows it together form *a single act of ritual*.

For the variable meaning of (*ἐπ*-)*ᾠνύμασσαν* see L.S.J. s.vv. *ἐπονομάζω* 4, *ὀνομάζω* IV; also s.vv. *ὀνομαίνω*, *προσεννέπω* etc. All these words can refer to the giving of a name or to its use on one or many occasions.

It seems impossible to discover a vocative to accompany *σέ*, and therefore we must resort to emendation. The required form must leave the accusative phrase *Αἰολήϊαν . . . γενέθλαν* as the direct object of *ἐπωνύμασσαν*. I propose *σύν δ'*, assuming the following sequence of corruption:

$$CYN\Delta' > CY\Delta' > CE\Delta'$$

The omission of N was due either to the weak pronunciation of final nasals, especially before a dental consonant in the next word, or to emendation by someone who thought an apostrophe was appropriate at this place. Subsequently the nominative pronoun was changed to agree with *Αἰολήϊαν κτλ*. For adverbial *σύν*, see L.S.J. s.v. C. 1, 2; this usage is not attested elsewhere in Lesbian poetry. (According to L.S.J. adverbial *σύν* in Homer is distinct from the corresponding usage in Attic, but this does not seem convincing. To me *σύν* in *Iliad* xxiii. 879 is essentially the same as *σύν* in Soph. *Ant.* 85.)

Tr. 'and at the same time (sc. along with Zeus) they invoked the famed goddess of the Aeolians, mother of all'.

Apart from the objections to *τόνδε* already mentioned, it is clear following the elimination of *σέ* that there is no place for a deictic word alongside *τὸν δὲ τέρτον*. It looks indeed as if *τόνδε* might be a duplication of *τὸν δέ*, at least in part. In these circumstances, I propose to retain *τόν* in l. 8 as the definite article and to restrict the area of corruption to *δεκεμηλιον*. This may be done with the more assurance because there is no other instance in Greek of the cult-name *Κεμήλιον* and because the word cannot be explained etymologically or by any other means.

For *δεκεμηλιον* I would read *Σεμελήϊον* 'son of Semele', and would explain the corruption as follows:

CEMEΛΕΪΟΝ > CEMHΛEΪΟΝ > CEMHΛΙΟΝ > KEMHΛΙΟΝ

The change of C to K may have been due to accident or to emendation of a false reading *σε μήλιον*, in which *σε* would go ill with the preceding *τόνδε*. *Δε* may have been not a mere repetition of *δέ* in l. 7 but a further attempt to mend the first syllable of *κεμηλιον*, *σεμηλιον*.

With *Σεμελήϊον* cf. schol. Ar. *Frogs* 479 (= *Anth. lyr. gr., carn. pop.* 24B Diehl) *Σεμελήϊ'* "Ἰακχε πλουτοδότα. At *Anth. Pal.* ix. 524. 19 we find the expression *Σεμεληγενέτην Σεμελῆα*, and it may be assumed that *Σεμελεύς*, son of Semele (like many other words in the same poem), is very old. Hence we may say that *Σεμελήϊος* comes regularly from *Σεμελεύς*, like *Αἰολήϊος* (here *Αἰολήϊαν*) from *Αἰολεύς*, and that it is not derived directly from *Σεμέλα*.

With *τόν* cf. l. 13 *τὸν Ὑρραον δὲ παῖδα*, also Z 24 1-2 *τὸν κακοπατρίδαν Φίττακον*.

A comma should be inserted after *ὠνύμασ[σ]αν*. The sense is then: 'and the third they invoked was the son of Semele, Dionysus, eater of raw flesh'.

Thus ll. 5-9 are seen to form an invocation, preliminary to a prayer. The invocation is described in narrative style in *past* time, and the three gods are named in the third person. The prayer follows immediately, without a formal transition, and is in *oratio recta* in *present* time, or at any rate with no definite indication of time.

University of Edinburgh

A. J. BEATTIE

ὑποκριτής

In *Studi in Onore di Ugo Enrico Paoli* (1955), pp. 469 ff. Professor Albin Lesky states a strong case in favour of the development of the sense 'actor' for *ὑποκριτής* from 'interpreter', not 'answerer'. The most important novelty in his article is the contention that valuable evidence is to be found in Pindar, fr. 140^b (Snell):

ἐρε-
θίζομαι πρὸς αὐτάν,
ἀλίου δελφίνος ὑπόκρισιν,
τὸν μὲν ἀκύμονος ἐν πόντου πελάγει
αὐλῶν ἐκίνησ' ἐρατὸν μέλος.

The conclusion which he draws is very important—it may even be thought to be decisive—if it is true. If there is any doubt about the matter, it is well that

it should be expressed and, if possible, eliminated promptly. I write this note because I do see reason for doubt; though I marvel at my rashness in controverting the opinion of so lucid a reasoner and so learned a scholar in this as in other fields.

What does *δελφίνος ὑπόκρισιν* mean? 'Sprachlich gebraucht wie *δίκη*' (Wilamowitz);¹ 'after the manner of . . .' (L.S.J.); both clearly incorrect. *δελφίνος ὑπόκρισιν* stands in apposition to the content of *ἐρεθίζομαι πρὸς αὐτάν*, and illustrates that content in terms (virtually) of a comparison. The genitive *δελφίνος* may be either subjective or objective. Lesky prefers to take it objectively: the meaning will then be (in his words) 'die nachahmende Darstellung des Delphins'; 'I am roused to the sound, and my behaviour is as if I were enacting the part of a dolphin when it hears the flute'. He then makes two points: (i) that we have here already in Pindar a usage of *ὑπόκρισις* which presupposes the established usage of *ὑποκριτής* as 'portrayer of a role'; (ii) 'and herein above all lies the importance of the passage—there is really and truly no means of bridging the gap between this usage and the sense "answer" for *ὑποκρίνεσθαι*'. The former of these points is important only (as Lesky says) because it dates back to Pindar a usage hitherto not certainly attested until later (but see Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals*, p. 127, quoted by Lesky, p. 474): it does not in itself throw light upon the question how the word *ὑποκριτής* came to mean 'actor'. What matters is the second point: is it true that the usage of *ὑπόκρισις* here is a great or even insuperable obstacle to the derivation of 'actor' from 'answerer'? Surely it is not true, whether *δελφίνος* be subjective or objective.

If the genitive is objective, the sense will be, in effect, '(my behaviour is comparable to) the enacting of the part of a dolphin at the sound of the flute'. If subjective, it will be '(comparable to) the way in which the dolphin performs its part (that of a dancer in the sea) when it hears the flute'. In either case the passage will be strong evidence that *ὑποκριτής* already meant simply 'actor': but, if so, it would leave as open as ever the question whether 'interpreter' or 'answerer' was the sense from which 'actor' ultimately developed. That is to say, Lesky's first point invalidates his second: if this passage presupposes (and I agree that it does) that '*ὑποκριτής* as portrayer of a role was already fully established', then *ὑπόκρισις* here is simply an example of that fully established usage. This passage makes it clear that the word might already be used to signify simply 'acting', 'portraying a role': the fact that a presumed *original* sense would not fit here is immaterial, since it is (we are agreed) being used in its *fully developed* sense; Pindar fr. 140^b is no more helpful to us than any other example of the fully developed sense, e.g. Ar. *Vesp.* 1279.

I hope that Professor Lesky will enrol me among the staunchest supporters of 'interpreter' (or the like) against 'answerer': I only doubt whether this particular piece of evidence is as cogent as it appears at first sight.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. L. PAGE

¹ Professor D. S. Robertson, whose advice I have sought and taken on the most important points, observes that this is at least

as old as Boeckh: '*ὑπόκρισιν* est *δίκη*', translated *instar*.

VITRUVIUS' WATER-MILL

IN *de Architectura* x. 5. 2 the Augustan engineer Vitruvius provides the only description of a grain-mill that has come down to us from antiquity when, after discussing some machines for raising water by means of water-wheels, he continues thus (the text is that of Granger's Loeb edition):

Eadem ratione etiam versantur hydraleae,¹ in quibus eadem sunt omnia, praeterquam quod in uno capite axis tympanum dentatum est inclusum. Id autem ad perpendicularum conlocatum in cultrum versatur cum rota pariter. Secundum id tympanum maius item dentatum planum est conlocatum, quo continetur. Ita dentes tympani eius, quod est in axe inclusum, impellendo dentes tympani plani cogunt fieri molarum circinationem. In qua machina inpendens infundibulum subministrat molis frumentum et eadem versatione subigitur farina.

Granger translates:

Mill wheels are turned on the same principle, except that at one end of the axle [sc. of the water-wheel] a toothed drum is fixed. This is placed vertically on its edge and turns with the wheel. Adjoining this larger wheel there is a second toothed wheel placed horizontally by which it is gripped. Thus the teeth of the drum which is on the axle, by driving the teeth of the horizontal drum, cause the grindstones to revolve. In the machine a hopper is suspended and supplies the grain, and by the same revolution the flour is produced.

This text and translation have behind them the authority of great Vitruvian scholarship, and there can be no doubt that both are in the main correct. There are, however, a few points which deserve re-examination since neither Granger's interpretation nor those in modern discussions of the passage appear to deal with them satisfactorily. Such discussions—in connexion with relevant archaeological discoveries—are those by Blümner (*Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, vol. i² [Leipzig, 1912], p. 48, notes 1–2), Jacobi (*Saalburg Jahrbuch*, iii [1912], 91 ff.), and, more recently, Parsons (*Hesperia*, v [1936], 76 ff.). Jacobi deals with the passage in connexion with certain millstones found on the Roman *limes* in Germany, and Parsons does so in the course of a most valuable report on a water-mill of the fifth century A.D. which has come to light in the Athenian agora. (Unfortunately Parsons does not seem to have been aware of Jacobi's article.) The parts of the passage to be re-examined here are (a) the third sentence (*secundum id . . . continetur*) and (b) the last four words of the Latin text.

(a) Granger's translation of the third sentence, in taking *secundum id tympanum maius* together, leaves the subject of the sentence to be understood. This seems unbearably harsh, and the natural translation of the text as it stands is surely, 'adjoining this, there is a (second and) larger drum, also toothed and placed horizontally . . .'

Yet Granger's translation is based not only on common milling practice—since the gearing ratio is usually such as to make the millstones revolve faster than the water-wheel²—but also on some archaeological discoveries from the Saalburg in Germany, where, in a well belonging to the early third century A.D., two of the working parts of a Vitruvian mill were found in 1912. One of these is a spindle, 32 in. long and fitted at one end with iron dovetails which fit

¹ This word is Schneider's emendation for *hydraulae*, confirmed by a passage in Strabo (xii. 566) and by *Edict. Diocl.* xv. 54 (see T. Frank, *Econ. Survey*, v. 367); cf. Hesych. s.v. ὑδρόμυλοι and Blümner, *Technologie u.*

Terminologie i². 46, notes 2–4.

² Cf. 'Die Steine . . . wollen gar noch schneller sein (than the water-wheel)' in a well-known German song; *Oxford Book of German Verse*, p. 285.

accurately enough into dovetail-shaped recesses in the lower (grinding) surfaces of the upper millstones found in considerable numbers in the same fort. Near its other end this spindle is of a square section which fits into the central hole of the other discovery. This consists of two strong oak disks, 8 in. in diameter and 1.6 in. thick, which are bound by iron rings and kept apart by six forged iron bars, $1\frac{1}{4}$ in. in diameter and $6\frac{1}{2}$ in. long. Jacobi thought, probably rightly, that these working parts were thrown into the well to make the mill useless to an enemy.

It is hard not to see in the 'drum' (i.e. the oak disks with the iron bars between them) one of the Vitruvian *tympana*, and if so, its evident connexion, via the spindle, with the upper millstone shows that it must have been the second *tympanum* which was 'placed horizontally'. It is evident from the size and shape of this 'drum' that the vertical *tympanum* must in that case have been a toothed wheel which was considerably larger, with the result that the mill must have revolved faster than the wheel by which it was driven.

In order to reconcile this normal practice with the natural grouping of words in the text of Vitruvius many editors¹ have either substituted *minus* for *maius*, or—perhaps better—added *minus* after *maius* to read *secundum id tympanum maius minus item dentatum planum est conlocatum*, 'adjoining this larger drum there is a smaller drum, also toothed and placed horizontally'.

Yet, in the case of the mill found in the Athenian agora the horizontal gear-wheel (53.5 in. in diameter) was larger than the vertical (43.7 in.), with the result that the stones must have revolved more *slowly* than the water-wheel. Though unusual, this arrangement would be suitable enough for a stream or mill-race in which (as was probably the case at Athens) a small volume of water flows fairly rapidly. It suggests that the gearing ratio probably depended on the current of the stream (i.e. speed and volume of water) in which the mill was to be placed, and shows that the ratio prescribed in the manuscript text of Vitruvius was at any rate not unknown. In view of this, the manuscript reading must surely be retained as representing what Vitruvius probably wrote; nor is Granger's attempt to reverse the gearing ratio by an artificial grouping of the Latin words necessary.

There is, however, a further difficulty in the same sentence. No satisfactory parallel appears to exist for the generally accepted interpretation of the word *continetur* at the end of this sentence ('is gripped', Granger; 'meshes', Parsons; etc.); nor does this seem a very natural meaning of the word. Accordingly other editors have found this interpretation unsatisfactory and have assumed that the text as it stands is incomplete. Thus Krohn (Teubner, 1912) marks a *lacuna* and Morgan (Harvard University Press, 1914) translates, 'and this is attached to the millstone'—presumably supplying *mola*.² Fra Giocondo, the renaissance editor of Vitruvius (Florence, Junta, 1522), fills the '*lacuna*' somewhat more elaborately, thus:

secundum id tympanum maius item dentatum planum est conlocatum, quo continetur AXIS HABENS IN SUMMO CAPITE SUBSCUDEM FERREAM, QUA MOLA CONTINETUR. Ita dentes . . .

¹ e.g. Rose (Leipzig, 1867 and 1899), Morgan, Reber, and Prestel; cf. Jacobi, loc. cit., pp. 92–93.

² This conjecture may be connected with a mistaken idea, expressed in Overbeck–Mau, *Pompeii*⁴, p. 388, that Vitruvius' water-mill made use of stones like those belonging to

the 'hour-glass' mills familiar from Pompeii. In fact, however, archaeological discoveries have shown that the stones of Roman water-mills were of quite a different shape and much more like modern millstones than those of the Pompeian animal-mills.

Fra Giocondo's 'somewhat cavalier scholarship' is well known, as is also his preoccupation with the practical application of the rules of Vitruvius. The fact that the words supplied by him do not appear anywhere in the fairly large manuscript tradition of Vitruvius also argues against the genuineness of his reading, which is unanimously rejected by modern editors, though Jacobi in his comment on the passage retains it.

At the same time Giocondo is here describing what is with equal unanimity accepted as the correct construction of the mill to which the passage in Vitruvius refers, and extant stones leave no doubt that this is so. But although this says much for Giocondo's engineering talents it does not by itself argue for the retention of his reading in the text.

There is, however, more to be said for Giocondo's reading than that. The word *subseus*, first of all, not only aptly describes an iron dovetail of the kind found by Jacobi in Germany,² but it is itself a Vitruvian word.³ Secondly, modern editors have apparently overlooked the fact that Giocondo's reading agrees with the possibility that the second of two lines both ending in *continetur* has dropped out of the text. This is hardly an indication of 'cavalier scholarship', and the reading here under discussion is in strong contrast with many other insertions which Giocondo would make in the text of Vitruvius. For these reasons it is suggested that this reading deserves more serious consideration than it has received hitherto.

(b) Granger's translation of the last four words of the passage ('by the same revolution the flour is produced'), in which he agrees with practically all others who have dealt with the passage,⁴ does not seem to give the sense required by Latin usage. There are several passages in classical Latin containing the phrase *farinam subigere* and similar phrases:⁵ in all these *subigere* means 'to knead' or 'to mix until smooth'. In connexion with flour in particular the word always appears to denote the process of preparing the dough, in which the flour is made to absorb water.⁶ Admittedly the verb is used in agricultural contexts to denote the 'breaking up' of the soil,⁷ and this might seem to justify an interpretation which makes it mean 'to reduce the particle size' of grain by milling. In view of the many other passages, however, this meaning can hardly apply to grain and flour, and it is to be noted, moreover, that *farina*—not *frumentum*—is the subject of the verb in the present passage.⁸

Vitruvius, therefore, seems here to be alluding to a kneading-machine attached to the same water-wheel by which the mill was worked. The kneading-machine is the constant companion of the well-known Pompeian animal-mill, both in the milling establishments at Pompeii and Ostia and on some pictorial

¹ Granger, vol. 1, p. xxiv.

² Indeed *axis habens in summo capite subseudem ferream* exactly describes one of the two parts found by Jacobi.

³ Cf. Vit. iv. 7. 4, and Fest. p. 307 Müll.
⁴ With the notable exception of Blümner, pp. 48 and 64 n. 4.

⁵ e.g. Cato, *Agr.* 74, *farinam in mortarium indito, aquae paulatim addito subigitoque pulchre. ubi bene subegeris, defingito* . . . ; [Virg.] *Moret.* 47 f., *iamque subactum levat opus*; cf. Cato, *Agr.* 18. 7; 76. 1; Plin. *N.H.* xviii. 105; Cato *ap.* Plin. *N.H.* xvii. 111.

⁶ Cf. *perdomare* in Sen. *Epist.* 90. 23; also Blümner, p. 61 n. 2.

⁷ e.g. Cic. *Leg.* ii. 18. 45; Virg. *Georg.* i. 125; Ov. *Met.* xi. 31.

⁸ An apparent exception occurs in Plin. *N.H.* xxii. 127 (*farina in pollinem subacta*). Here *subigere* seems to mean 'to (re-)grind'; but the whole section is omitted in some manuscripts, and *redacta* appears in others. Even if genuine, the passage rests on Dioscor. *M.M.* ii. 85 (Wellmann), and the words in question may well be a mistranslation on Pliny's part.

monuments.¹ It is therefore not unlikely that the *pistor* who substituted water for animal power for the grinding of the grain would wish to knead his dough by the same means. The words *eadem rotatione*, which make little sense on the accepted view, will then have a very definite meaning.

The brevity of the reference to the kneading-machine and the lack of even the slightest detail may seem to argue against this view, but an illustration in Vitruvius' original text may have made the meaning clearer. In any case it must be remembered that Vitruvius was not primarily concerned with milling and breadmaking technique, but merely with the principle of transmitting the power of a vertical water-wheel to the driving of horizontal engines. The interpretation here suggested, moreover, is made all but certain by a reference to kneading-machines in very similar words in the writings of the jurist Paulus.²

The mill described by Vitruvius is one which was not substantially improved upon for approximately eighteen centuries. For this reason alone an attempt to discover precisely what it is that he describes must surely be worth while.

University College, Cardiff

L. A. MORITZ

QUID DO UT (NE): A BARGAINING CONSTRUCTION IN JUVENAL AND THE SENECAS

MODERN commentators on Juv. 7. 165-6 (*quid do ut totiens illum pater audiat?*) and on Sen. Contr. ix. 3. 11 (*quid do ne indicaverim?*) and 12 (*quid do ne liberos meos recipiam? quid do ne agnoverim?*) are agreed on the character of the expression. 'A standing phrase' says Owen (*J. Phil.* xxxiii. 242). 'Apparently a colloquial idiom' says Duff. 'Gehört der Umgangssprache an' says Friedländer. 'Den Eindruck einer volkstümlichen macht' says O. Rebling (*Versuch einer Charakteristik der römischen Umgangssprache*, Kiel, 1883, p. 48).

But if they are agreed on the character of the expression they differ strangely over its interpretation. Duff renders it, 'I'd give anything for'. Owen in his translation has 'What would I pay . . . !' This, however, is not readily intelligible to English readers even with the substitution of an exclamation-mark for the question-mark in his Latin text; so the Loeb editor, G. G. Ramsay, who translates in similar fashion, 'What would I give that . . . !', adds a footnote: 'The English idiom would be "What would I not give." ' Bornecque's translation of Seneca, goes boldly for it with a thrice-repeated 'Que ne donnerais-je pas?' Rebling falls back on the vagueness of the imperfect subjunctive with 'Was gäbe ich darum?'

The *Thesaurus* treats of the construction under *do* (col. 1663, ll. 41-46), and generalizes it as: '*do aliquid (pecuniam sim.) ut (ne)*'. That is, this is a bargaining construction in which the noun or pronoun in the main clause expresses the price to be paid for the desired end expressed in the final clause. From the examples given we should take away two (Sen. Ben. iv. 11. 1 and Gaius, Inst. iii. 90) which are both examples of a quite different construction, and we should add one from Terence (*Phorm.* 633) which is earlier than any of those quoted. We then find that we have a pleasingly typical case-history of a colloquial

¹ e.g. the cenotaph of the *pistor redemptor* pp. 64-65).

Eurysaces outside the Porta Praenestina at Rome, Blümner fig. 14b (cf. generally

² Sent. iii. 6. 64: *machinae quibus farinae subiguntur*.

construction with some twenty occurrences ranging from Terence through Cicero, Ovid's *Amores*, the Senecas and Juvenal to St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and the *Peregrinatio* of Aetheria. The price in the main clause is expressed five times by a noun (as Cic. *Verr.* ii. 1. 101, *pecunia, ne accusaretur, data*), thrice by an indefinite pronoun (as Sen. *Contr.* vii. 2. 1, *ut uno ictu pereat, tantum dabo*), and twelve times by the interrogative pronoun *quid*.

In six of these last twelve cases, Ter. *Phorm.* 633 (*quid vis dari*), Cic. *Verr.* ii. 5. 118 and Vulg. *Gen.* 38. 16 (*quid dabis*), Ov. *Am.* ii. 17. 30 (*quid non dedisse velit*), Aug. in *Psalm.* 142, 10 (*quid dedisti*), and Itin. [*Silv.*] 34 (*quid darent*), the translation is straightforward and undisputed: 'what do you want me to (will you, would she not be willing to, did you, would they) pay?' It is, however, worth noting from the Ovidian example that if a Latin author wanted to say 'what would she not give', he could say it naturally with *quid non* and the subjunctive. About a seventh case, Juv. 3. 184 (*quid das ut Cossum aliquando salutes?*), there would be no dispute had not its interpretation been infected by that of the other Juvenalian passage. The gist of ll. 183-9 may be simply rendered: 'Everything costs money at Rome. What do you pay for the privilege of greeting Cossum occasionally? You pay over all that money to his slaves.' So Ramsay takes it. But Owen translates vaguely, 'What are you prepared to give?'; and Duff (on 7. 165) says, 'Cf. 3, 184, *quid das* (i.e. you give much).'

There remain the five awkward examples of *quid do*, Sen. *Contr.* ix. 3. 11, *ibid.* 12 (bis), Sen. *Ep.* 79. 5, Juv. 7. 165. These are not exactly analogous to *quid das* in Juv. 3. 184; the rendering 'what am I in the habit of paying, what do I generally pay?' would manifestly suit none of the contexts. The self-questioning 'What am I paying?' is equally out of place. There have been two other interpretations offered:

A (offered by commentators on Seneca's *Epistles* and by Pearson and Strong in their school edition of Juvenal): that this is a quasi-deliberative use of the present indicative which may be rendered, 'What am I to pay, what must I pay?' or even, similarly in English, 'What do I pay?'

B (offered by the commentators on the elder Seneca and Juvenal quoted at the beginning): that this is an idiomatic expression of great desire which, whatever the details of its parsing, has much the same effect as the English 'What would I not pay?'

I hope to show that, while both these interpretations would make sense of the Juvenal passage, Interpretation A is slightly preferable in the *Controversiae* and vastly preferable in the *Epistles*.

- (1) *Contr.* ix. 3. 11 et illud dixerat (sc. CESTIUS): placet mihi in inritum revocari quae gesta sunt. quid do ne indicaverim? ARGENTARIUS dixit ex altera parte miseriorem se nunc esse quam cum ignoraret suos; et cum tormenta paterni animi descripsisset, ait: etiam nunc pacisci volo. quid do ne liberos meos recipiam? quid do ne agnoverim? Indignabatur CESTIUS detorqueri ab illo totiens et mutari sententias suas.

A father exposed two children; the shepherd who reared them showed them to the father on condition that he should retain one. The father tries to take both back. There is a dispute. Cestius is speaking on behalf of the foster-father. Here interpretation B only makes the father's two *quid do*'s ejaculations loosely attached after *pacisci volo*, and gives no point to Cestius' subsequent indignation.

For there would be no real *detorsio* or *mutatio*, if Argentarius had merely parried one 'what wouldn't I give' with another; whereas, if he had taken up Cestius' loose rhetorical question ('What do I pay to have it all undone?') as though he were genuinely bargaining and had answered it with some bargaining of his own, Cestius might well feel piqued. At any rate the proximity of the verb of bargaining (*pacisci*) should make one think that this is likely to be the same kind of remark as in vii. 2. 1 above, *ut uno ictu pereat, tantum dabo: pro Cicerone sic liceat pacisci?*

- (2) *Ep.* 79. 5. *quid tibi do ne Aetnam describas in tuo carmine, ne hunc sollemnem omnibus poetis locum attingas?*

Seneca writes to the poet Lucilius who is touring Sicily. The succeeding passage shows that Seneca has no wish to stop Lucilius from describing Etna. Here interpretation A suits, interpretation B does not. 'What would you take not to' is tolerable chaffing. 'What wouldn't I give to stop you' is intolerable rudeness.

When one has seen that interpretation A suits the specific cases whereas interpretation B is almost impossible in one and inferior in another, then one is struck again by the general inherent superiority of the former. On the one hand we have a quasi-deliberative use of the present indicative, idiomatic and colloquial indeed, but simple and amply attested (see Summers on *Sen. Ep.* 79. 5 and, for its particular use with *quid*, S. A. Handford, *The Latin Subjunctive*, pp. 62-63). On the other we have an idiom otherwise unattested, involving the use of *quid* and the indicative where Ovid and any modern Latinist would use *quid non* and the subjunctive.

All Souls College, Oxford

C. J. MORSE

OTIOR

Oti is one of the words described by Lewis and Short as 'rare but classical'. Rare it certainly is; it is cited only from *Cic. Off.* iii. 58 and *Hor. Sat.* i. 6. 128. It is questionable, however, whether it can be called classical without qualification. Ernout and Meillet, *Dict. étym. de la langue latine*³, s.v. *otium*, likewise describe it as 'rare, mais class., opposé par Cic. à *negōtior*', while Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus*⁷, vol. 2, s.v. *otiari*, translating the word by '*feiern, ruhen von einer Arbeit*', note that it is a rare equivalent of the normal *cessare*, and add the reassurance 'aber es steht auch bei Cic. *off.* 3, 58'. The claim that the word is classical is evidently based on its occurrence in Cicero; but it seems to have been overlooked in this case that a word may occur in Cicero without being Ciceronian. The passage in question reads 'C. Canius, eques Romanus nec infacetus et satis litteratus, cum se Syracusas otiandi, ut ipse dicere solebat, non negotiandi causa contulisset e.q.s.' It is noteworthy that dictionaries, in quoting this passage, omit the clause 'ut . . . solebat', which by its position refers particularly to *otiandi* and by its emphatic *ipse* shows that Cicero is citing the word from Canius. For the use of an *ut*-clause in reference to diction and usage may be adduced, for example, *Cic. Fam.* iii. 8. 3 'hominem non solum sapientem uerum etiam, ut nunc loquimur, urbanum'; Varro, *R.R.* i. 2. 1 'ab aeditumo, ut dicere didicimus a patribus nostris; ut corrigimur a recentibus urbanis, ab aedituo'. *Oti* is not Ciceronian in the sense of belonging to Cicero's

regular vocabulary, and the opposition of *otior* and *negotior* must be credited not to him but to Canius.

On Hor. *Sat.* i. 6. 128 Porphyry's commentary contains the acute observation 'uerbum finxit quod significat otium ago'. This note seems to err only in attributing the invention of the word to Horace. That it was a neologism is probable enough both from its rarity, which implies that it did not exist as a normal member of the Latin vocabulary, and from the humorous tone of the two contexts in which it occurs. The fact that so easy and obvious a formation, supported, moreover, by the parallel *σχολάζω*, is nevertheless excluded from serious diction must be due less to the rivalry of *cesso* and *uaco* than to some positive disqualification arising from the circumstances of its creation. If, then, *otior* is a humorous neologism, is it not at least plausible that its inventor was C. Canius, a man noted, it seems, for his wit ('nec infacetus'), of which an example is given in the only other extant reference to him, Cic. *de orat.* ii. 280? This supposition would account well for 'ut ipse dicere solebat', in which not only *ipse* but also *solebat* deserves attention; Canius may have made frequent conversational use of his Syracusan holiday, thus providing himself with opportunities of repeating a favourite joke.

Otior now appears to have been originally not a banal derivative of *otium* meaning 'to be at leisure', but to have been deliberately coined as a humorous counterpart to the already existing *negotior*, to which (despite their formal etymologies) it stands semantically as negative to positive. Since *negotior* means 'to be engaged on business, to be a business man', we may do justice to both form and substance of Canius' witticism if we call him the first Uncommercial Traveller.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

ATHENAEUS viii. 332 c

... φεύγει πηδῶν καὶ ἀσπαίρων, ἕως ἂν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ ἀποκυμβήσῃ.

ἀποκυμβήσῃ is the reading of the manuscript tradition apart from the Parisinus (C), and is accepted by Kaibel and Gulick, and by Wehrli (Clearchus, *fr.* 101; *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, iii. 38). C reads ἀποκυβιστήσῃ, and is followed by Schweighauser and more recently by Peppink. Neither word occurs elsewhere; the former is rather odd, and ἀποκυβιστήσῃ looks like a conjecture based upon it, probably by the compiler of the epitome contained in C. It has the wrong associations, however, those of performing a tumbling-act (so *κυβιστῶν* and its derivatives), and the correct reading is more likely to be ἀποκολυμβήσῃ, which has parallels and is preferable both from the palaeographical point of view and from that of sense: cf. Thuc. iv. 25. 4 μίαν ναῦν αὐτοὶ ἀπόλεσαν, τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποκολυμβησάντων, Dio xlix. 1. 5 πολλοὶ γὰρ φθειρομένων ἐν τῇ ναυαγίᾳ τῶν σκαφῶν ἀπεκολύμβησαν.

If ἀποκυμβήσῃ is kept, it must be taken as

connected with κύμβη ('head') and κύμβαχος, with ἀποκυβιστήσῃ as a conjecture or gloss.

D. A. REES

Jesus College, Oxford

(H) ABRONICHOS

'WARNER wrongly follows BCEFM in docking Habronichus of his rough breathing'; so M. Chambers in his *Cl. Weekly* review (xlviii [1955], p. 165) of the new Penguin Thucydides (on i. 91. 3). Chambers may be right, but according to Arnold's second edition (Oxford, 1840), A and B are the only manuscripts which have the rough breathing, and all the Herodotus manuscripts (in viii. 21) also have the name with a smooth breathing; so does the manuscript of the Themistocles Letters (Hercher, *Ep. Gr.*, p. 743, lines 1, 3, 19, 47; p. 751, lines 4, 5; see the *adn. cr.* on pp. lxxx and lxxxi). In support of this spelling may be mentioned the etymology of ἀβρός < ἀ-βάρος given by Eustathius (p. 1447, lines 49-50), in the *Et. Mag.* (s.v. ἀβρός) and in the *Et. Gud.* (s.v. ἀβρός);

among the moderns, E. Boisacq simply offers (*Dict. Etym.*⁴) ἀβρός.

New evidence in support of the spelling Abronichos comes from an Agora ostrakon (P 15647) which E. Vanderpool published in *Hesperia* (Suppl. viii [1949], p. 395 and plate 57/2). The name, written retrograde, may be confidently read as ΑΝΤΡΟΝΙΧΟ[Σ]. Instead of recognizing here the otherwise unknown name Ἀν<δ>ρόνιχο[s], one may take it to be Ἀν<ρ>όνιχο[s] = Ἀβρόνιχο[s]; for the insertion of N and the change of B into Π, see K. Meisterhans, *Gramm.*³, p. 84, § 32, nos. 4-5, and p. 77, § 29, nos. 2-3. The same name has been restored in *I.G.* ii. 717 by W. Peek, *Wiss. Zeitschr. der Martin-Luther-Univ. Halle-W.* iii (1954), p. 380. There are three more ostraka (still unpublished: P 17731, P 18225, P 18226) on which the name of Habronichos can be restored; unfortunately, the beginning of the name is missing in all cases. Two of these ostraka (P 17731 and P 18226) contain the demotic Lamptreus, and the father's name Lysikles is known from Herodotus, Thucydides, and from the Letters of Themistocles.

Without giving any weight to the obviously wrong etymology of ἀβρός < ἀ-βάρος, it can be stated that there is sufficient evidence available to show that the name of Habronichos son of Lysikles from Lamptraí was written without rough breathing; for similar cases, see Meisterhans, p. 87, § 33, no. 4; Raubitschek and Jeffery, p. 45, no. 41 (and the examples cited there).

A. E. RAUBITSCHKE

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

HOW ANTILEON'S TYRANNY ENDED

ARISTOTLE, *Pol.* 5. 10. 3, 1316^a29 ἀλλὰ μεταβάλλει καὶ εἰς τυραννίδα τυραννίς, ὥσπερ . . . , καὶ εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν, ὥσπερ ἡ ἐν Χαλκίδι ἡ Ἀντιλέοντος, καὶ εἰς δημοκρατίαν, ὥσπερ . . .

Alcaeus 296 (P2) a8 (end of poem) μάλλον' ε' ἀξίως Ἀντιλέοντος[ος¹ δὲ] ἥς ἀποδέρθη.

P. MAAS

Oxford

HYACINTHUS AGAIN

IF there is a consistent piece of evidence about the ancient hyacinth (which all agree is not our modern hyacinth at all), it is that

¹ ἀντιλέοντος[ος edd.: correx. On tyrants in Euboea cf. E. Ziebarth, *Inscr. Graec.* xii. 9, p. 147.

the markings on it suggested to the beholder (1) the letter A, (2) the letter Y, (3) the letters AI. The A, of course, was traditionally referred to Ajax, who might be loosely described as a Homeric King. In Virgil's third Eclogue (106-7) Menalcas says: 'Tell me in what land flowers grow with names of kings inscribed on them?' And the flower in question is supposed to be the hyacinth.

Now Salmasius and Sprengel held, according to Keightley (*Bucolics and Georgics of Virgil*, 1847), that the ancient hyacinth was our Iris; and Professor H. J. Rose has pointed out that the thin lines on the petals of the Iris sloping into one another could have suggested an A or an AI, and if you turn the flower round, a Y.

John Gerrard in his *Herbal, Of the Historie of Plants* (London, 1597, p. 102) describes the 'bulbed Floure de luce', which, he says 'is called of Lobel, Iris Bulbosa and also *Hyacinthus flore iridis*; of some *Hyacinthus Poetarum*'; and these flowers, he tells us, 'do grow naturally in Spain and Italy wilde'.

I cannot accept the various flowers with spots, e.g. the fritillary (see C. Garlick, *C.R.* xxxv [1921], 146), that scholars have tried to identify with the ancient hyacinth. If you have a preconceived idea of an A or AI or Y, you can, of course, join up the spots to form these letters. But the unanimous testimony of antiquity is that the markings suggested these letters. Nor can I think that an undistinguished and humble little flower like the fritillary would be appropriate to the mighty Ajax or the favourite of Apollo.

A problem arises, however, in connexion with the colour.

Virgil (*Ecl.* iii. 63) speaks of the hyacinth as *suave rubens*, which would normally suggest some sort of red, though not necessarily. In *Georgics* iv. 183 he describes the flowers as *ferrugineos* (the colour of rust? the bluish colour of iron melted in the furnace? a greenish colour, seen sometimes on rusted iron?). Ovid (*Met.* x. 211 f.) calls the hyacinth that sprang from the blood of Hyacinthus *Tyrio nitentior ostro* and *purpureus*, and at *Met.* xiii. 394-5 the bloodstained ground produces a purple (*purpureum*) flower with 'letters' referring to Hyacinthus, to Ajax, and to the cry of woe.

Can it be that the poets concentrate on the red colour because it is appropriate to the wound of Hyacinthus but that in fact there were ancient hyacinths of various colours? I myself saw red irises at a recent flower-show in Johannesburg. Botanists tell me that although these red irises are due to modern cross-fertilization, the possibility of such products in the course of nature in ancient times

cannot be ruled out. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says of the Spanish Iris (*Xiphium*) that there are 'beautiful varieties of the most diverse colours'. In Paxton's *Botanical Dictionary* (London, 1868) *Iris Iberica* is described as red. In Ascherson and Graebner, *Synopsis der Mittel-europäischen Flora* (Leipzig, 1905-7), the Iris Paradoxa, related to the Iberica, is described as 'Lebhaft violett'. Engler and Parnkl, *Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien* (2nd ed. Leipzig, 1930), give 'violett, rotbraun' for *Iris Stolonifera*.

It seems, then, that we cannot rule out the Iris on grounds of colour; and as regards the markings it was much more likely to suggest the letters indicated by the ancients than the dots on the Fritillary or the Martagon Lily. But it occurs to me that all the conditions are fulfilled by *Gladiolus Communis* (Ger. Schwert-lilie), which is related to the Iris and has similar markings; and in that case we should have no difficulty about the colour red.

T. J. HAARHOFF

University of the Witwatersrand
Johannesburg

JUVENAL'S OTHER ELEPHANTS

hic est quem non capit Africa Mauro
percutsa Oceano Niloque admota tepenti
rursus ad Aethiopum populos aliosque ele-
phantos? (Juvenal x. 148-150)

I ASSUME that the reading *altos* is no longer seriously defended; the gloss in P (*praeter Indicos*) and the fact that, for the ancients, its smaller size was one of the most important characteristics differentiating the African elephant from the Asiatic¹ argue decisively for *altos*. But what does Juvenal mean by *altos elephantos*? The ancients knew two types, the African and the Indian. But a comparison with the Indian elephant is quite out of place here, especially since Mauretania was the region particularly associated with the African variety.² Commentators have therefore been driven into seeing a reference to the existence of elephants in Ethiopia, and draw attention to xi. 124 ('dentibus ex illis quos mittit porta Syenes'). Against this it may be pointed out that we should expect a

previous reference to the North African elephant, and such a reference is not to be found, nor can its lack be supplied by the 'Gaetula belua' which appears eight lines later.

If the comparison implied in *altos* is neither with the Indian nor with the North African elephant, only one possibility remains. Juvenal must be thinking of the elephants of Hannibal's army, inseparably associated in every Roman's mind with that commander's name. The sense of line 150 might then be 'to the tribes of Ethiopia, where there are more elephants (as if Hannibal had not enough already)'. This is just possible, but the information that there are elephants in Ethiopia is gratuitous and pointless, unless it is implied that Hannibal desired to extend his power southward into Ethiopia; and such an implication has no justification in fact.

We may come nearer to discovering Juvenal's point—and that he is here making a point cannot be doubted—if we look closely at the immediate context. He is defining the boundaries of Africa. 'Mauro . . . oceano', 'Nilo . . . tepenti' and 'Aethiopum populos' are used here as *geographical* terms. So, too, I suggest, are the words 'aliosque elephantos'. Juvenal seems to have known that there were elephants in Ethiopia: he cannot have failed to know, even without his special knowledge of Egypt, that there was an important town on the frontier between Africa and Ethiopia whose name certainly suggested elephants—Elephantine, referred to by Josephus (*Bell. Iud.* iv. 611) as ἡ 'Ελεφάντων καλουμένη πόλις. Here was a name very appropriate to be associated with the great elephant-minded general. We might translate line 150: 'stretching back to the tribes of Ethiopia and the place of yet more elephants!'¹ The jest is hardly translatable, but it is quite in Juvenal's manner, and the allusion to an important Roman garrison town (cf. Tac. *Annals* ii. 61; P.-W. v. 2322. 61 ff.) would surely not be lost on Juvenal's readers. Characteristic of Juvenal, too, is the indirect, quasi-cryptic reference to a place; cf. x. 50 (Abdera), 171 (Babylon), together with Mayor's note on x. 171.

ERIC LAUGHTON

University of Sheffield

¹ Cf. Daremberg-Saglio, ii. 536; Livy xxxvii. 39, Pliny, *N.H.* viii. 9, Pompon. Mela iii. 7.

² Daremberg-Saglio, loc. cit.

¹ Or possibly: 'stretching back to the tribes of Ethiopia and elephants with a difference!'

REVIEWS

THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION IN EARLY GREEK LITERATURE

HERMANN FRÄNKEL: *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. Literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien. Pp. xx+316. Munich: Beck, 1955. Paper, DM. 24.

At the request of former colleagues and pupils in Germany Hermann Fränkel has chosen for publication in this volume twelve articles, of which seven, originally published in English, have now been translated into German. There are some additions and revisions, but so far as I can see he has nowhere been moved by subsequent criticisms or discussions to make any essential changes. A complete list of Fränkel's writings is supplied. Some portions of the items here presented may be regarded as preliminary studies for his *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*, on which I would refer to *C.R.*, n.s. iii. 146 for some distinctive features, not all recalled in the present review, of Fränkel's standpoint.

It may perhaps be true to say that Fränkel's primary interest has been in the problems involved in the study of 'style', by which is meant the intimate union of thought-content on the one hand, and, on the other, expression in words, in arrangements of words and sentences, and in the mutual relations of the structural parts in any complex literary whole. The last article in this book is a sample of the detailed interpretation and exposition of texts in which he is particularly skilled; it is an application of his methods to passages of Caesar's *de bello Gallico*. Its chief merit lies in the ability to give interest and life to the written word, and this merit ought not to be obscured by the disagreements which may, and must, arise when he is presenting more difficult, or less self-contained, works to the consideration of the reader. It would seem to be a corollary from this article that 'interpretation', as the art is understood by Fränkel, can be successful only in the measure to which the author—Caesar, in this instance—has *dominated* his material, maintaining a consistent point of view and imposing a definite pattern of 'style' throughout. In particular, where fragmentary texts like those of the early Greek philosophers are in question, it may often be that a thinker has not so consistently thought out his position or adhered so faithfully to his 'thought-patterns' as Fränkel seems inclined to assume. The paper on 'A Thought-pattern in Heraclitus' illustrates at once the suggestiveness and the frequent inconclusiveness of his results. Heraclitus is certainly fond of expressing himself in 'proportional' statements; for example, in fr. 79 man is to child as god is to man. But when he says that the sun's breadth is that of a human foot, is that a ratio to which some other ratio was said to correspond (or not to correspond)? The attempt to make explicit all the proportions which may conceivably lurk hidden in the fragments, is necessarily highly speculative; for, as has been truly said in criticism, many fragments 'are equally susceptible to other explanations' (G. S. Kirk, *Heraclitus, The Cosmic Fragments*, pp. 78, 281). How far Plato's fondness for proportional statements (of which the 'Line' is the most formidable example) owed its initial impetus

to the influence of Heraclitus, is similarly matter for conjecture rather than optimistic certitude. A trick of style is an insecure basis on which to found, for example, the discovery of a 'new fragment' of Heraclitus in *Rep.* 533 d (where the 'mud' is no more Heraclitean than at 363 d or *Phaedo* 69 c), or the deduction that Plato's 'Cave' is based on something that Heraclitus may have written. On the other hand, in 'Heraclitus on God and the Phenomenal World' his suggestion *ἐλαϊον* in fr. 67, instead of Diels's *πῦρ*, though falling short of certainty, has a very high degree of probability, supported as it is by a striking parallel in Plato, *Tim.* 50 e. Here the other terms in the proportion-sum would be the oil-base of perfumes and the spices which are dissolved in it. At this point it seems appropriate to mention the short article on 'Heraclitus on the Notion of a Generation' which successfully disentangles the confused testimony of Philo on this point.

In the pre-classical style of writing the connexion of thought is not brought out by the subordination (hypotaxis) of the less important or even by what might be thought the proper (from the classical point of view) connecting particles, but tends rather to be left to the understanding of the reader. And understandings may legitimately differ. Where opposing members of a complex idea are independently expressed the result may be a paradox or at least a puzzle. When parts of the complex are suppressed or, as may happen with fragments, lost, it is too much to expect unanimity on the question to what thought-pattern (if any) the surviving parts belonged. It is, however, to Fränkel himself that we owe a very great deal of our knowledge of these matters. His earliest study of pre-classical Greek style, 'Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur', appeared in the Göttingen *Nachrichten* in 1924, and it is useful to have it in the present volume since it is still compulsory reading for all students of archaic prose and verse. (I regret that the binder has omitted a quarter of it from the copy supplied—the buyer is hereby warned.) This stimulating study of the *λέξις ἐιρομένη* describes such compositional features as 'Ringkomposition', 'Priamel', contrasts and comparisons devoid of conjunctions of comparison, and other results of writing in sequences of 'links', each link being separately constructed and but loosely connected with its fellows to form the 'chain'. With these go grammatical features such as polarity, or abrupt switchings between singular and plural or between direct and indirect speech. In this largely pioneering essay perhaps too little was made of the 'paratactic' features in Homer; the distinction of a specifically 'archaic' (Archilochus-Pindar) style within the paratactic (Homer-Herodotus) with corresponding epic and archaic tempers of mind, would still seem to be in need of elaboration; and the distinction, within the 'archaic', of a descriptive style (to which the concreteness of parataxis lends itself, for example, even in narrative passages of classical rhetoric) and an argumentative style (for which hypotaxis with its greater abstractness and its more explicit logic and 'motivation' is essentially suitable) seems superfluous, if not misleading. The essay has also been criticized for strained comparisons between Pindar and Herodotus (van Groningen, *Paratactische Compositie*, p. 5).

The relation between thought and form is of particular importance in poetry, and Fränkel has now rewritten his study, published some twenty years ago, of the interactions between metre and meaning in Homer and Callimachus. Its general object is, as before, to transpose into positive and meaningful form such apparently arbitrary prohibitions, regarding caesura and diaeresis, as

Hermann's law, which forbids a trochaic word-ending in the fourth foot. I am not sure that Fränkel has quite made up his mind on the meaning of caesura (and diaeresis). It is not necessarily a pause (p. 149) and yet it was 'audible' in recitation; he should surely have explained that, if audible, it is audible not phonetically but, if one may put it so, mentally. Much is left undone; e.g. there is no explanation of the kind of lengthening which is usually explained (in a manner which Fränkel rejects) as due to metrical ictus. In agreement with other investigators (e.g. E. G. O'Neill in *Yale Classical Studies*, viii. 116) he finds that Callimachus 'refined' the Homeric hexameter, but only in the sense that with him the exceptions to the 'rules' become rarer.

'Studies in Parmenides', with interesting speculations on Anaximander and other matters and an allegorical interpretation of Parmenides' journey, need not be summarized here. I find of especial interest the attempt to show the equivalence of external divine influence upon the poet or thinker (inspiration) with his inner divine power (genius); this reading of the 'archaic' mind might well have been tested by a wider application. The section on the meaning of *δίκη* in Parmenides is also noteworthy. This comprehensive concept covers not only the physical force which binds reality, but also the 'inner logic' of things which provides due rewards and sanctions for all actions. The word never meant mere 'custom', but in all its uses (including *δίκην* and a genitive) referred to an intrinsic aptness of persons or things to act or react in definite ways. A consideration of 'Zeno of Elea's Attacks on Plurality' appropriately follows. A review of Ciurnelli on Anaxagoras contends that Anaxagoras' *νοῦς* dealt with its raw materials in no mere mechanical manner, but through the processes of *σύγκρισις* and *ἀπόκρισις* which represent intelligent choices and rejections. On fr. B 4 Fränkel seems convincing: the other world of men, duplicating this one, is a purely theoretical construction—if there were another world it *would* be exactly like this one, even in its social institutions.

Among the 'archaic' concepts studied is 'The Expression of Time in Early Greek Literature'. Here there is an interesting comparison between Homer and Pindar. With Homer 'time' (*χρόνος*) is empty duration, whereas 'day' (of any length) is filled with forces and events which can 'do things' to man. With Pindar *χρόνος* has taken over the positive content of 'day'. And so it is suggested that at *Ol.* 10. 102 *κείνον κατὰ χρόνον* is not a bare temporal expression but means the 'time of life', the 'bloom', enjoyed by Ganymede in the following relative clause. A supplement on 'Man's "Ephemerus" Nature' follows (see *C.R.* n.s. iii. 147). I note the admission that there is no possibility of maintaining a clear-cut distinction between 'short-lived' and 'unstable', 'subject to the changing conditions of one's "day"'. One of Fränkel's arguments against 'short-lived', as an 'archaic' meaning, seems to involve the false assumption that *ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν* was used (in the fifth century B.C.) to apologize for a metaphor or a paradox.

There remains a short article on 'The Immigrant's Bath'. According to Fränkel a bath in the local water is 'symbolic'; it means that the immigrant has comfortably settled down in his new home. Hence he suggests that Alcaeus fr. 77 (Diehl) refers to the successful foundation of a colony at the mouth of the Hebrus. This may be right, though in sober fact there seems to be no evidence for the alleged 'symbolism'; and it seems rash to take Pindar, *Ol.* 12. 19 as referring to Ergoteles' bathing practices. Besides, not only immigrants take baths when they imagine themselves secure after exertion or turmoil; Fränkel

himself remarks on the new poignancy he has discovered in the murder of Agamemnon.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

'DOGMATA QVISQVE SVA'

S. J. SUYS-REITSMA: *Het homerisch Epos als orale Schepping van een Dichter-Hetaïrie*. Pp. vi+118. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1955. Paper, fl. 5.90.

C. M. BOWRA: *Homer and his Forerunners*. (Andrew Lang Lecture, University of St. Andrews, 1955.) Pp. iv+42. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1955. Paper, 5s. net.

L. G. POCKOCK: *The Landfalls of Odysseus*. Pp. 16; 6 plates, 4 text figs. Christchurch (N.Z.): Whitcombe & Tombs, 1955. Paper, 3s. 6d. (N.Z.) net.

THE question whether the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written down at the moment of composition, or were composed orally and preserved only by memorization for a considerable period before they were first reduced to writing, is once again on the agenda; and much of the debate arises from the work of the late Professor Milman Parry of Harvard (1902-35), who is held by such authorities as Professors E. R. Dodds (*Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*, ed. M. Platnauer, 1954, pp. 13 ff.) and D. L. Page (*The Homeric Odyssey*, 1955, pp. 138-9) to have proved conclusively that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed without the use of writing. On the other side, Dr. A. B. Lord of Harvard, who is better acquainted than any other living man with Parry's work and with the materials which he left behind him, has argued forcibly (and in my opinion convincingly) that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are 'oral dictated texts', i.e. that they were written down by an amanuensis at the time of composition (*T.A.P.A.* lxxxiv [1953, published 1954], 124-34). A further source of uncertainty on this matter is the discovery, first announced in 1953 by Messrs. Michael Ventris and John Chadwick and now confirmed beyond any possibility of reasonable doubt, that Greek was already being written in Crete and on the mainland in the third quarter of the second millennium B.C. It is therefore appropriate that the first two of the three works to be discussed here deal with the question of how the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were composed.

Dr. Suys-Reitsma's work is a doctoral dissertation of the University of Amsterdam, accepted in 1955 (Professor J. C. Kamerbeek was the 'Promotor'), and it must be a matter for some surprise that the author nowhere gives any detailed consideration to the problems created by Ventris and Chadwick's epoch-making discoveries. He (or is it 'she'?) begins with a chapter entitled 'Doodlopende Wegen' ('Blind Alleys', pp. 1-13), in which we read of the bankruptcy of Homeric criticism, both analytical and unitarian, in the first quarter of the present century, before the dawning of the new light with Milman Parry's first publications on Homeric style in 1928. The second chapter ('Op nieuw Spoor', pp. 14-41) combines Parry's discoveries (especially his articles in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* for 1930 and 1932) with the work of H. M. and N. K. Chadwick on comparative literature into a suggestion that 'everywhere in Ionic Asia Minor' fellowships of poets must have existed, with

a threefold function: the composition of epic poetry, the training of their successors, and the preservation of their own poems and those of their predecessors. All this, it is argued, was done orally. The third chapter (pp. 42-65) treats of the Homeridae (and incidentally of the Creophylidae) as providing the 'rudiment' of such a fellowship of poets, and argues that the characteristics of the epic (which to our less instructed eyes may appear as 'faults') are due to the manner in which the poems were created, by a group of poets working together in one of these fellowships. The fourth chapter (pp. 66-92) deals with the cyclic poets, in whom (flatly against the ancient evidence, be it said) we are asked to see the growth of a tendency to abandon the anonymity which had been characteristic of the Homeridae and similar groups, and suggests that the cyclic poems are the products of one of these fellowships in disintegration. The final chapter ('Slotbeschouwingen', pp. 93-108) argues that English drama of the early seventeenth century provides analogies for the process of communal authorship suggested here as the origin of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Summaries in Dutch (pp. 109-111) and English (pp. 112-14) are provided. There is a long bibliography, which omits both Ventris and Chadwick's 1953 article (and all the articles which have flowed therefrom) and the relevant works of A. B. Lord and J. A. Notopoulos (for a list up to late 1953, see *Gymnasium*, lxi [1954], 36 n. 7), but no index. The tone is throughout altogether 'apodeictic', Bowra and Schadewaldt being especially singled out for reproach as misunderstanding the true nature of epic poetry. *Quid plura?*

Sir Maurice Bowra's lecture is, as one has the right to expect, much more up to date than Dr. Suys-Reitsma's work. He begins with Ventris and Chadwick, noting that their work and its consequences provide no support for T. W. Allen's view that there must have been a verse-chronicle of the Trojan War, composed not long after the war and preserved in writing; from there he goes on to the problem of Homer's literacy, and so to his sources. He is firm in his denial (which, coming from such an authority, would be hard for any reasonable person to reject) that there is any parallel in any other literature for the process by which (as the 'oralists' assume) an epic poem, composed in the eighth century or thereabouts, could have been preserved by memory alone until it was written down in the seventh or sixth century. He considers the possibility that Homer himself wrote his poem down as he composed it (for this he finds that there is no conclusive evidence), and also the possibility that Homer dictated his poem to an amanuensis—this he thinks the most likely explanation, and he might have strengthened his case considerably by a reference to Lord's arguments. 'Homer, then,' he writes, 'stands at a point where an ancient poetical tradition has just been touched by the new art of writing. . . . But it is to the purely oral art behind him that we must turn when we wish to examine his relation with the past'; and it is with this relation that the rest of the lecture is concerned. This gives a most valuable *mise au point* of what, at the time when Bowra wrote, was the latest available information about the historical, linguistic, and literary problems posed by Homer's relation with his predecessors. The whole thing is beautifully done; full command of the material and an exact sense of scale have produced what may rank as a model lecture, and one which we may feel sure Andrew Lang would have approved.

Professor Pocock's ingeniously argued and well-illustrated pamphlet has the sub-title 'Clue and Detection in the *Odyssey*'. It records the result of a visit to Sicily in 1952 in which the author set out to check the evidence for Samuel

Butler's assertion that the landscape of the *Odyssey* may be identified with places in the neighbourhood of Trapani, and hence that the *Odyssey* was composed in that area. It may be unfortunate for Pocock that his pamphlet should appear so close upon the heels of Mr. Robert Graves's fictional presentation of Butler's case in *Homer's Daughter*; but though he has pointed out many remarkable resemblances between the scenery of the *Odyssey* and the geography of Sicily and the islands to the north of it, I doubt if these resemblances are sufficient to establish his view that the *Odyssey* 'is a tale of feud and faction amongst the communities of the Elymi, and of the delicate relations existing between them and their Phoenician overlords'. There is too much evidence (see, for example, A. Lesky, *Thalatta*, 1947, pp. 151 ff., and G. Germain, *Génèse de l'Odysée*, 1954, pp. 511 ff.) that most of Odysseus' wanderings are to be understood as taking place outside normal geography altogether; and though that does not of course exclude the probability, even the certainty, that many of the descriptions are based upon real places, there may be some legitimate disagreement about the places which the author chose for description—and in any case his descriptions are not necessarily the result of autopsy. On this point the Laestrygons, with their midnight sun, fiords, and cannibalism (cf. H. M. Chadwick, *The Heroic Age*, p. 118), seem to me to be conclusive; and Pocock will have quite a lot of explaining to do before he can establish, as he seeks to do, that their land is to be identified with the Gulf of Castellamare, which is only just 'round the corner' from Trapani itself, and does not enjoy noticeably more daylight at any season of the year than his alleged Ithaca.

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

QUOT PROFESSORES, TOT ODYSSEAE?

LUIGIA ACHILLEA STELLA: *Il Poema d'Ulisse*. (Biblioteca di Cultura, 47.) Pp. xvi+444. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1955. Paper, L. 2,300.

DENYS PAGE: *The Homeric Odyssey*. (The Mary Flexner Lectures delivered at Bryn Mawr College.) Pp. viii+186. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. Cloth, 21s. net.

So many books on the *Odyssey* have appeared since 1939 that it is hard to repress a shudder of repugnance at the news that two more scholars have climbed upon the Homeric band-wagon; but on reflection one is bound to recognize that the problems raised by the *Odyssey* are inexhaustible, and that each new book makes its contribution (sometimes, it is true, only a negative one) to the pattern of our thought about the poem, and about the general Homeric problem. Not unnaturally, almost all the authors take what may (I hope without disrespect) be called a 'worm's-eye view' of the *Odyssey*, grubbing about among the roots of the poem and seeking to show how it came into existence; but a few have tried to see the poem as it may have appeared to the audiences for which it was intended, and have been ready to acknowledge by something more than lip-service that they are dealing with a great work of literature which, in spite of its many (and often staggering) defects of construction, has never in over two and a half millennia lost its power to enthral those who are prepared to take it as it is.

On the strength of the second part of her book (sub-titled 'La poesia', pp. 249-417), Professor Stella of Trieste must be welcomed as a most distinguished recruit to this small band. In five chapters devoted respectively to 'I modi della nuova poesia' (251-77), the heroic theme of the disastrous war (279-97), the adventurous theme of the unknown 'Oltremare' (299-345), the theme of the bitter home-coming (347-88), and the poet of Odysseus (389-417), she gives an unforgettable and well-nigh flawless account of the *Odyssey* as poetry. Some male scholars (Bentley among them) have opined that the *Odyssey* was composed 'for the women', and some literary men have even tried to convince us that its author was a woman; but (leaving Madame Dacier out of account, as for this purpose we are fully justified in doing) this is the first time to my knowledge that we have been given a full-length account of what the *Odyssey*, as a poem, may mean to a sensitive and cultivated woman who is at the same time a professional scholar. The case for the artistic unity of the *Odyssey* is here stated in limpid Italian, which defies the reader to lay the book down; Odysseus himself, with all his gifts of verbal enchantment, could hardly have improved on Professor Stella's performance, in her analysis either of the character of the poet or of the way in which the traditional formulae are given new lustre by the contexts in which they are used (a fine example is her treatment, at pp. 269-70, of xi. 334 *κατὰ μέγαρα σκιδέοντα*). Professor Stella's statement is of course *ex parte*; but it is made without a trace of polemic (there is hardly a reference to the views of any other scholar), and the author's modesty and sincerity shine through every word.

I have thought it proper to begin with the second part of Professor Stella's book, partly because it is an essential complement to what Professor Page has written, but mostly because the first part of her work (sub-titled 'La cultura', pp. 1-248), though beautifully written and throughout a model of controversial good manners, seems to me to come to entirely impossible conclusions, and to arrive at them by an almost completely one-sided attitude to the evidence. In this section, which is divided into three chapters, she deals first with the historical basis for the *Odyssey* ('Lo sfondo storico', 1-56) under three main headings: the evidence for Achæan civilization in the poem, including customs, opinions, and even language (especially the 'fraseologia protocollare aulico', of whose existence it is well that the modern *Schwärmer* for Milman Parry should be reminded), then the historico-geographical 'Orizzonte', including such perilous identifications as 'Attarissyas—Agamennone Atride?' but also some valuable pages about the Phœnicians (almost the only point at which Professor Page and she are recognizably talking about the same poem), and lastly the age of the *Odyssey*. Here she argues that the *Odyssey* as a whole is much earlier than the *Iliad* and far nearer to the Bronze Age (she speaks of the end of the second millennium as her *terminus ante quem* on p. 52, but p. 54 shows that she means the tenth century). Very full notes (pp. 57-83) follow this and the other two chapters, and show how deeply and widely Professor Stella has studied the literature of her subject. In the second chapter ('La tradizione letteraria', 85-149; notes 150-76), Professor Stella deals with the evidence for epic before the *Odyssey* and the development of the conventions which form so large a part of the epic style and diction; she devotes a good deal of space to a most interesting discussion of the use by Near Eastern and Mesopotamian poets of literary devices similar to those of 'Homeric' epic, but fails (at least in my opinion) to show that there is any causal connexion between them. She

also discusses whether there was a written Achaean literature (which is still a very open question, even after the recent discoveries), the role of folk-lore in the *Odyssey* (on which her conclusions are surprisingly negative), and the relation of the *Odyssey* to 'la novellistica egiziana' and the adventures of Gilgamesh (under both these headings she might have been helped by an acquaintance with G. Germain's *Genèse de l'Odysée*, had it appeared a little sooner). The third chapter ('Il ambiente religioso', 177-231; notes 232-48) deals with the differences between the Odyssean and the Iliadic Olympus, the resemblance of the Odyssean Olympus to what we know of Mycenaean religion, the wrath of the gods, magic, the myths of the Sun's cattle and the pillars of Heaven, and Odysseus' journey to the land of the dead (which she persists in calling 'Averno'; this is even more objectionable than her use of 'Ulisse' for Odysseus, since it suggests an affinity between Homer's underworld and Virgil's which does not exist, and in any case rests upon a misunderstanding of Virgil's use of *Auermus*).

In considering Professor Stella's views, we must remember that she passed the proofs in June 1954 (see the 'Avvertenza' added to her Preface, pp. xv-xvi), when she had not had time to assimilate the consequences of Ventris and Chadwick's article on the Linear B script (*J.H.S.* lxxiii [1953], 84 ff.), and her work must be judged accordingly; but one cannot help being influenced by one's knowledge of these and later developments in one's feeling that in emphasizing, as she does, the Achaean and Bronze Age elements in the make-up of the *Odyssey* she was even then backing the wrong horse, and that she ought to have paid more attention than she does to the views of Miss Lorimer (to whom she often refers, though usually only to express disagreement). As a convinced unitarian, too, she ought in my opinion to have devoted more thought to the problems of transmission, and to those details of language which Professor Page has so convincingly studied. The Bronze Age elements are undoubtedly present in the *Odyssey*, but there are other, much later, elements as well, both in culture and in language, and in shutting her eyes to them Professor Stella has produced a case which will hardly stand up to the most elementary cross-examination. It remains to add that Professor Stella's bibliographies (both the general one on pp. xiii-xiv, and the special ones in the notes) are admirably full (Monro's edition of Books xiii-xxiv, with its masterly appendix, is the only notable absentee), and that her indexes include a most valuable 'Indice bibliografico degli studiosi'.

Professor Page's book is in almost every respect the antithesis of Professor Stella's; but the most striking difference is in the general tone of the two works, since Professor Page is almost always polemical, often unnecessarily dictatorial, and at times unbecomingly rude to eminent scholars whose only offence seems to be that Professor Page does not agree with their opinions. Quite apart from the effect of this sort of thing on Professor Page's reputation as a scholar (which is his own affair), it is apt to prejudice his readers against the case which he is trying to present; and that is a pity when (as in the present book) his case merits careful attention, and deserves to be recognized as shedding new and (in my judgement, for what it may be worth) conclusive light upon one very important section of the Homeric problem. It must, however, be premised that Professor Page has set himself in the first instance to answer a question which no longer has any real meaning, namely whether the *Odyssey* was composed by a single author or by a number of authors. This shows that he is operating with an obsolete conception of what is meant by saying that the *Odyssey* is an artistic

unity; if there are still any academic troglodytes who believe that 'Homer' was the author of the *Odyssey* in the sense in which Thackeray was the author of *The Newcomes*, or even in the rather different (and more relevant) sense in which we call Shakespeare the author of *Hamlet*, and who are still unacquainted with the works of earlier *Analytiker*, they may be embarrassed by the very clear proofs assembled (not, in most cases, for the first time) by Professor Page that there are inconsistencies in the incident of Polyphemus (pp. 1-18; notes 18-20), in Odysseus' visit to the underworld (21-47; notes 47-51), in the beginning of the *Odyssey* (52-73; notes 73-81), its middle (82-98; notes 98-100), and its end (101-30; notes 130-6), which cannot possibly be reconciled with the idea of such single authorship; but the rest of us, who have already assimilated the idea of an evolutionary 'Homer', are likely to be surprised only that, if Professor Page's observations are true (and I cannot see any easy answer to them), any Greek should have been at once such a numskull as to think that his interpolations were improving the *Odyssey* and so clever as to have them accepted as the genuine work of Homer. This is the dilemma which any work on 'the Homeric *Odyssey*' directed, as this originally was, to a mainly undergraduate audience, ought to discuss; alongside the excellent summary which Professor Page gives us of the post-mortem dissections of the *Odyssey* by the disintegrators from Kirchhoff to Merkelbach (he does not mention Marzullo), we need (but do not find) some explanation of why the alleged corpse remains so impressively and obstinately alive. In these chapters Professor Page speaks throughout as an advocate (a brilliant advocate, be it said, who knows just how to present his material and how to turn his opponent's flank by a neatly-timed claim to be speaking without prejudice); and I cannot suppress a feeling that, however much his young hearers may have enjoyed the brilliance of his presentation, the enjoyment of the moment is not very likely to have compensated them for the arduous researches which they will have to make to find out the case for the other side. The sixth chapter (pp. 137-60; notes 160-4) falls into three main sections, in which Professor Page seeks to establish secure foundations for what he admits must be guesswork about the method, time, and place of composition of the *Odyssey*. Of these the first is based on the claim that Milman Parry *proved* (my italics) 'that the Homeric poems were *composed* and carried in the mind, and recited by word of mouth, and that this was the only method of their composition, and this for a long time the only mode of their publication' (p. 138). In this quotation I have italicized the words which are fundamental to Professor Page's argument, and which (as 'three minutes' thought' might have convinced him) go far beyond anything which Parry's work or the subsequent work of A. B. Lord, J. A. Notopoulos, and others can properly be thought to have proved. In the second section, which of course depends on the first, Professor Page argues that the date for the *culmination* (my italics) of the *Odyssey* should lie between 900 and 700 B.C. (one can almost hear the ghostly applause of Herodotus, to whom Page does not refer, but what would Herodotus, or any other knowledgeable Greek, have made of that word 'culmination'?). The third section is, if I am any judge, the one really original thing in the book; in it Professor Page gives the results of what seems to be an admirably thorough examination of the vocabularies of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and comes out with what I think we are bound to accept as conclusive evidence that the two poems were composed by persons working in different linguistic traditions. He argues further that the two poets or groups of poets must have lived in

regions isolated from each other, so that neither knew the other's work. Of this I am not so certain; the uniformity of characterization which Stanford (in *The Ulysses Theme*) and others recognize in the two poems, and the way in which the *Odyssey* 'joins on' to the *Iliad* without interval or overlap (the *Iliad* 'goes down to' the death of Achilles, and the *Odyssey* picks up the story with his funeral), suggest to me that there must have been some interaction, but Page makes it clear that this did not extend to matters of vocabulary. I must confess that this discovery is a disappointment to me; ever since Von der Mühl argued that the same man had given the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* their final form, I have hoped against hope that the single Homer might one day be reinstated—but the evidence marshalled by Professor Page leaves no loophole for this that I can see. After this, it is almost an anticlimax to add that there is an appendix (165–82) dealing with certain matters arising out of the 'Telemachy', which confirms the conclusions of Klingner and Focke that there never was an independent poem about Telemachus. The indexes are scrappy by comparison with Professor Stella's; and the names of modern scholars are conspicuous by their absence.

One final point: Professor Page makes a great deal of play with the Pisistratean recension of the Homeric poems, basing himself on the evidence collected by Merkelbach (*Rh. Mus.* xcv [1952], 23 ff.) which he calls 'a most valuable and timely reminder against the fashionable practice of neglecting or despising some very awkward facts' (p. 135, n. 32). The detailed examination of this point would require more space than is available here, but I think that it can be shown that the facts are more awkward for those who accept than for those who deny the historical reality of this Pisistratean recension. I may perhaps be allowed to refer to my article, 'Peisistratus and Homer' (*T.A.P.A.*) lxxxvi [1955], 1 ff.), in support of this opinion.

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

THE OSLO MUSICAL FRAGMENT

S. EITREM, LEIV AMUNDSEN, and R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM: *Fragments of Unknown Greek Tragic Texts with Musical Notation*. Pp. 87; 2 plates. Oslo: Brøgger, 1955. Paper.

THE appearance of a new fragment of Greek music is always noteworthy, and when it is combined with a text indicative of a tragic theme, it will arouse even greater interest. But as often happens with so mutilated a papyrus, hopes of finding a vital clue to some of the unsolved mysteries of Greek melody are not fulfilled, and if this fragment helps to confirm certain current hypotheses, it is inconclusive in others and even tantalizes us with its own new problems. The text too contains some puzzling features.

The papyrus, which is dated by its editors to the second century A.D., contains, apart from a dozen additional scraps, portions of nineteen lines of text with the music superscribed in the usual way—possibly by a different hand, and it is concluded on certain metrical and musical evidence that the actual date of composition may not differ widely. Personal names which occur

include Achilles, Trojan women, Lemnos, Deidameia (apparently), and—assuming restoration of the initial letter—Pyrrhus. There is reported an epiphany of Achilles with accompanying cosmic disorders, including the unfolding of an underworld scene, at which sight the Trojan women discard swords in terror, to the relief of the speaker who recognizes the voice of the dead hero; an invocation of Lemnos on familiar lines follows, and a reference to its most notable resident Hephaestus, then a further mention of Achilles.

Even with such meagre information, and by correlation with the corpus of post-Homeric legend, many a tragic plot has been reconstructed with some certainty, but Eitrem and Amundsen show how difficult it is to accommodate these outlines to any other version of an epiphany of Achilles, especially as the action must presumably have taken place—if Deidameia is in fact the person addressed—not at the scene of the exciting events but on the island of Scyros, where Deidameia's life seems to have been uneventful after her amour with Achilles and the departure of Neoptolemus for Troy. The subsequent apostrophe of Lemnos, an island certainly associated with Neoptolemus, but in the distinct Philoctetes legend, is also disturbing.

Unfortunately the reading of the name Deidameia, though almost inescapable, is enigmatic in that the original writing (distinct from later mutilation) involves an omission, erasure, and partial rewriting, for which the editors can suggest no solution. As regards the continuity, the narrative is certainly in anapaestic metre, whereas the Lemnos invocation is apparently in iambic trimeters. Although a clear space intervenes within the line of text, there is nothing to show that the two portions did not follow one another in performance.

The suggested solution of the latter problem is that here we have not a fragment of one play, but part of an anthology of separate scenes (perhaps linked by the story of Neoptolemus' fortunes), and that the papyrus is part of the 'score' of a travelling *τραγῳδός* who gave in local towns what might be termed the ancient equivalent of the operatic recital. Winnington-Ingram in his treatment of the music finds this theory agreeable, and suggests that this may be the composer's manuscript, thus explaining a peculiarity in the music, that in places a *double* line (of vocal notation) appears, which may indicate that one thought replaced another during the actual process of composition. If this is correct, the papyrus perhaps brings us nearer than ever before to the actual musical life of the Greek world. Certainly the music, in relation to the words, is not written with the care one might expect of a copy intended to preserve a record of text and music.

The anthological hypothesis has much to recommend it, although doubtless other reconstructions will be suggested. Perhaps the key to the transition from 'A' to 'B' is the appearance of Achilles in his famous armour—this may occasion the Lemnos invocation, which certainly proceeds to some description of Hephaestus' craftsmanship. Alternatively, if this is a musician's text, it is not impossible that a spoken part intervened between the melodic portions.

While the melody is too fragmentary and uncertain in reading to be interesting in itself (and few are so well equipped as to venture with Winnington-Ingram on his careful identification of the scales employed), the new fragment has great importance on two counts: (1) it provides further evidence of the correlation of accentuation and musical pitch observed before in the Seikilos song and Delphic hymns; (2) particularly rich in rhythmical notation, it confirms that the *στυγή* denoted the 'arsis' syllable. These topics are treated

separately in valuable appendixes which are virtually independent of the interpretation of the papyrus itself, as the whole corpus of Greek music is studied in comparison.

Among some disquieting features for the metrician (e.g. *θάρα* is rhythmized as a dactyl) is the fact that *δέ* before *ῥμοῦ* (written with *scriptio plena*) in the iambic portion bears its own note, and we might happily accept a passing suggestion that the musical setting of the iambs may be an amateur's 'perverse experiment'. Nevertheless I find it hard to believe that even an amateur familiar with the more recondite musical and rhythmical notation failed to recognize a trimeter, even without elision made, and feel that this underlines how uncertain still may be our metrical assumptions based on poetry sung, not scanned. It is not inconceivable that the 'elided' vowel could make here (in modern terminology) an *acciaccatura* on the note of the succeeding vowel.

Whatever the solution of these textual and musical problems, it seems safe to predict that the papyrus will amass its own scholarly literature, in which the *editio princeps*, with its meticulous description of the papyrus readings, will necessarily take pride of place.

University of Edinburgh

E. K. BORTHWICK

STICHOMYTHIA IN GREEK TRAGEDY

WALTER JENS: *Die Stichomythie in der frühen griechischen Tragödie*. (Zetemata, Heft 11.) Pp. 104. Munich: Beck, 1955. Paper, DM. 9.50.

IN this account of stichomythia Dr. Jens is not concerned, except incidentally, with the verbal characteristics of this form of dialogue, which have been briefly treated in Hancock's *Studies in Stichomythia*; he is concerned with content rather than form, and seeks to trace the developments in the use of stichomythia considered as an element in the general dramatic technique of Aeschylus and Sophocles. In the first 33 pages he goes systematically through the plays of Aeschylus, discussing each passage of stichomythia. In the next 53 he deals similarly with four plays of Sophocles, *Ajax*, *Trachiniae*, *Antigone*, and *Oedipus Tyrannus* (which he places in that order), and in the last 10 pages he discusses more briefly the use of stichomythia in *Electra*, *Philoctetes*, and *Oedipus Coloneus*. He concentrates on Aeschylus and the earlier plays of Sophocles on the ground that after the *O.T.* there is no further advance of any significance in the use of stichomythia, so that the material he has selected enables him to trace the development of this form from the earliest extant examples to the most highly developed use.

An inquiry on this topic naturally raises a question about what to include under stichomythia. Strictly speaking, of course, the term denotes single-line dialogue (which may perhaps be taken to include half-line dialogue), a distinct kind of dialogue which has certain verbal characteristics and can formally be considered in isolation. But if we are thinking of content, of the part played by a passage of dialogue in the development of a scene, we cannot maintain a distinction between one- and two-line dialogue, since in *P.V.* 39 ff., for example, and often in Sophocles there are passages which dramatically constitute a single conversation and consist of both one- and two-line dialogue. As we should expect, then, Jens indicates that his definition includes two-line (and of course

half-line) dialogue. But we cannot stop here: there are also passages where, in a conversation which dramatically must be considered as a unit (e.g. *O.T.* 319-79), the characters speak partly in one- or two-line dialogue but are sometimes given three, four, or five lines. In fact, once we go beyond stichomythia in the strict sense, the only valid distinction is between dialogue, of which stichomythia is a particular variety, and set speeches. Jens does not discuss this point, though on one occasion he refers to a passage which falls outside the range of his definition as 'free stichomythia'. Nor does he go at all deeply into the question why strict stichomythia is the predominant form of dialogue in Greek tragedy, or what special effects are achieved by this as compared with a freer form of dialogue; it might, for instance, have been worth while to follow up some suggestive remarks of Fraenkel in his *Agamemnon*, vol. iii, p. 626. It might almost be said that Jens is less interested in stichomythia as such than in the relative importance of set speeches and dialogue in the development of plot and character. Here the chief impression that emerges from his survey is the increasing importance of dialogue, of the dramatic as compared with the epic and lyric elements, and the increasing extent to which turning-points and new developments in the plot are presented in dialogue rather than in speeches. The point is not new, but has not perhaps hitherto been so clearly brought out or expounded so systematically. The systematic treatment of every relevant passage has, however, the disadvantage that sometimes the author has inevitably nothing new to say, and either does not give much beyond a paraphrase or writes a paragraph to the effect that we have here another example of what we have seen before. Apart from the main line of development which he is illustrating, Jens's treatment of individual passages is generally sensible and scholarly. It is perhaps odd that he should discuss the stichomythia in *Septem* 1042-53 and mention one or two features as unusual or unique in Aeschylus without any reference to the fact that the whole passage from 1005 to the end is commonly regarded as spurious.

When the development of some aspect of dramatic art can be correlated with fixed points of chronology, it is natural to ask whether it will help to fix the order of plays not securely dated by external evidence. Variations in the occurrence of *antilabe* have been so used by Jebb and others; Jens believes that the steadily increasing importance of stichomythia in the working out of plots can similarly be used. This criterion certainly scores a success where other internal evidence seems to have led us astray, since on the ground that there is more variety and freedom in the use of stichomythia in the *Supplices* of Aeschylus, Jens had already dated this play after the *Persae* and the *Septem* (as indeed Nestle had done in *Gnomon* 1934, p. 414), before papyrus evidence for the later date was known. On the same criterion Jens would put the *Trachiniae* considerably earlier than the *O.T.* His conclusion, for which there is other evidence, e.g. the linguistic evidence presented by Earp, may well be right; but in view of our very limited material this particular criterion of date, perhaps indeed most kinds of internal evidence, should be used with caution. Thus Jens compares *O.T.* 1117 ff. with *Trachiniae* 380 ff., and though he tends to exaggerate the parallelism, there is in both passages a secret to be revealed, and in some other ways the two scenes proceed on similar lines. The great difference is that in the *O.T.* practically the whole passage consists of strict stichomythia and the truth is extracted by close cross-examination, but in the *Trachiniae* the stichomythia only prepares the way for the set speeches in which Deianira appeals to

Lichas to confess the truth and he does so. Jens observes that a cross-examination of Lichas would have been dramatically effective, 'allein — um ein solches Verhör darzustellen hätte er der techné des O. T. bedurft'. It is, however, rash to assume too readily that differences of technique are purely a matter of date, and it might be argued that whereas such a cross-examination in the *O. T.* is not only dramatically effective but also in keeping with the character and conduct of Oedipus, it would have been less appropriate for Deianira.

The book as a whole is a welcome addition to this series of monographs. It is a pity that it has no index—an omission likely to impair the usefulness of any work of scholarship.

Bedford College, London

P. T. STEVENS

AGATHON

PIERRE LÉVÊQUE: *Agathon*. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon: Lettres, iii. 26.) Pp. 176. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper.

AGATHON is no easy subject for a sensible monograph. We can form a clear general impression of his character as man and writer from the combined testimony of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, the *Symposium*, and incidental observations in Aristotle and later critics; but of his work only some thirty fragments survive, of which one is six lines long, another four, and all the rest two lines or less; only four fragments are assigned by our sources to particular plays, and of these four titles two seem so incompatible with the fragments that emendations to the titles have been suggested. In addition we have four titles of plays from which no fragments survive; of these, two are doubtful and a third raises major difficulties.

It is thus an important merit of Lévêque's that (unlike some of his predecessors) he tries throughout to be sensible and not to go beyond the evidence. Sometimes the temptation proves too much for him; for instance, in dealing with the *Ἄνθος* (pp. 105 ff.) he sees the essential point, that to emend *Ἄνθει* in *Ar. Poet.* 1451^b21 into a mythological proper name makes nonsense of the context, and rebuts with ease Gudeman's attempt to justify *Ἄνθη* from the Arabic version: yet his heading for this section is 'Le drame bourgeois—La Fleur' as if we had direct evidence of the nature of the play, and he refers to it in similar terms on p. 154. There are other doubtful arguments: e.g. p. 19: 'Ecrivain pour un peuple qui connaissait Agathon . . . Aristophane était contraint de le peindre avec vérité'—how would this work if applied to Socrates? Pp. 40 ff.: he is much too ready to argue from single words in the parodies contained in the prologue of the *Thesmophoriazusae*: e.g. does the use of *πρόμος ἡμέτερος* by Agathon's servant (*Thesm.* 50, Lévêque p. 41) show that the poet was liked by his staff? P. 75: the chronological argument from the *Symposium* (172 c) is very precarious. Plato's chronology is by no means always consistent, e.g. the allusion to Pherecrates' *Ἄγριοι* (*Prot.* 327 d) is incompatible with the other evidence for the dramatic date of the dialogue. And Athenaeus actually quotes the passage (and the *Prot.* passage) expressly to show *ὅτι πολλὰ ὁ Πλάτων παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἀμαρτάνει* (v. 217 c). But fortunately Lévêque has a good argument as well as a bad one, and he sees (p. 74) that the words *ποῦ σιν* (*Frogs* 83) make it most probable that Agathon was still alive when the *Frogs* was produced. P. 88, n. 1: the evidence for a parody of Agathon at *Eccl.* 1

from Σ ad loc. is negligible: Σ says *υποπτεύεται ὁ ἱαμβος ἢ τοῦ Ἀγ. ἢ τοῦ Δικαιογένους, διὰ τὰς ἐταίρας ἐγκαθιζομένας* (23). P. 118: why must three commonplace fragments (fr. 23-25) about *φθόνος* all come from the same play? (Lévêque himself quotes parallels from several plays of Euripides.) But these are incidental lapses, and on the whole Lévêque succeeds in steering clear of fanciful hypotheses.

But sometimes he seems to pay a price for this virtue. Through forbidding himself to fill out his book with speculations he appears to have run short of matter. (Incidentally, he might have given us a text of the fragments.) The first of the book's two sections, 'La Personnalité d'Agathon', in particular, is prolix and repetitive in much of its 65 pages. Nor does Lévêque's analysis go very deep: if he had thought more about the connexion between Agathon's personality and his aesthetics this section could have been much better, and incidentally he would not have made the unhappy observation (p. 153) 'Il [Agathon] s'efforce de revigorer la tragédie'.

The second part of the book, 'L'Œuvre d'Agathon', is much more substantial, and the examination of the fragments is a valuable piece of work; but in the closing chapters on 'L'Inspiration générale de l'œuvre' Lévêque is compelled to rely mainly on external evidence, especially Agathon's discourse in the *Symposium*, and when he tries to argue from the fragments he overworks the evidence. Do the fragments on *φθόνος* or *ἔρως* really show 'la richesse de son analyse psychologique' (p. 118)? Do such commonplaces as fr. 5, 8, 9, 20 really show 'cette même attitude réflexive, ce même besoin de connaître l'homme et le monde' etc. etc.? Nevertheless, Lévêque's main point, that Agathon was influenced by the sophistic movement, seems sound.

There are some mistakes in single points, e.g. p. 32 *περὶ σοῦ ἄγροικόν τι δοξάζειν* (*Symp.* 194 c) means not 'trouver quelque défaut d'élégance en' but 'think churlish thoughts about', *οἷα ἂν ἄγροικος δοξάζοι*. P. 38: Agathon in *Thesm.* should not be said to enter 'roulé sur l'eccyclème'. P. 59: surely it is an exaggeration to say 'la présence d'Agathon [in *Thesm.*] ne fait pas avancer l'action' when he provides the necessary props. P. 138, n. 1 (on *Thesm.* 52): the high-flown para-tragic language of the context seems to tell conclusively against taking *δράματος ἀρχάς* as 'prologues'. There are some minor misprints, of which *Ἀγάθων* for *Ἀγάθων* (*Thesm.* 30, p. 37) is typical.

The defects of this book are largely due to efforts to say something useful when nothing can usefully be said; but it is clear that its careful and well-read author could do good work on a more rewarding subject.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

THE TEXT OF THE EPIGRAMS OF THEOCRITUS

ROBERT J. SMUTNY: *The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus*. (Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 15, No. 2.) Pp. 76. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955. Paper, \$1.

THE scholar who investigates the *Textgeschichte* of Theocritus' Epigrams has two problems to solve: (1) what is the interrelation of such manuscripts as contain these poems, and (2) what is the connexion of these manuscripts with

the unique manuscript of the Palatine Anthology (AP) which also contains them. Mr. Smutny devotes his first four chapters to problem (1) and chapters five and six to problem (2). There follow a Conclusion and a Stemma.

Until some nine years ago the sources whence an editor could derive his text of the Epigrams were the above-mentioned AP, the two Ambrosian manuscripts C and K, the Parisian D, and the two early editions of Junta in Florence and Callierges in Rome, both generally supposed to derive from a lost manuscript known as Cod(ex) Pat(avinus). In his edition of Theocritus published in 1946, however, Gallavotti, arguing that C, Call, and Junt were copies of D, and that, in turn, D was a copy of K, reduced the sources for Theoc. *Epp.* to the manuscripts K and AP. Gow, in his edition of 1950, wisely restored Gallavotti's ousted victims, and Smutny argues convincingly in support of this restitution. The only novelties with which he presents us are (1) the theory, which can scarcely be proved or disproved, that the corrections in D (which he refers to as D² or D^{corr.}) derive not from a scribe's haphazard emendations but from a definite manuscript—since lost—which he designates by the letter θ ; (2) the view that the late and fragmentary Heidelberg manuscript (Cod. Pal. gr. 341; Smutny's *Heid.*) is of some value in deciding the text, as it seems to have close affinities with Call and Junt. However, in Chapter iv Smutny comes to the conclusion that *Heid.* is *not* an independent witness to Cod. Pat. but 'a derivation of Musurus', seeming thereby scarcely to make good his own argument. In Chapter iii he upholds convincingly the independence of C, a manuscript which Gallavotti and, after him, Gow regarded as a copy of D. It is perhaps a pity that Smutny should use the sign B for Cod. Par. gr. 2721, since that letter to all students of Theocritus' text stands, or at least since Wilamowitz's edition has stood, for Cod. Pat., while Cod. Par. gr. 2721 is an unimportant manuscript of the K family, from which D was apparently copied, and owes its sign merely to the fact that in Ahrens' edition it is cited as second in order (not in importance) of the Paris *codices*. Smutny might at least have used the sign 'B(Ahr.)'.

When we turn to problem (2) Smutny has much of interest to offer. He starts by showing that the Epigrams were first collected in the bucolic manuscripts and later introduced into the Anthology: *not*, as some have thought, the other way about. He goes on to suggest that these epigrams entered the Anthology at two different times and from two different bucolic collections. The first of these, which he calls Bucolic Collection i, he takes to have been a large body of bucolic poetry gathered together by Artemidorus and headed by *Ep.* 26 (*A.P.* ix. 205). The second, Bucolic Collection ii, introduced by *Ep.* 27 (*A.P.* ix. 434), he thinks contained only poems by or attributed to Theocritus. This collection supplied *Epp.* 7–22. Smutny further holds that at some later date these two collections were fused into an edition (Bucolic Collection iii), which became the archetype of such medieval families as C and K and their congeners.

This, it will be recognized, is much the same as Wilamowitz's theory of a collection of *bucolica* edited by Artemidorus and another collection of *Theocritea* edited by Artemidorus' son, Theon; but Smutny differs from Wilamowitz (1) in his dating: i.e. he regards this Artemidorus not as the first-century scholar but as of late imperial date—this on the not very convincing ground that no fragments of the epigrams are to be found in the papyri; (2) in the question of the identity of the editor of Bucolic Collection ii: i.e. he doubts, with

Reitzenstein and Gow, whether Theon ever produced an *edition* of Theocritean epigrams, or indeed was responsible for anything more than the *ὑπομήματα* attributed to him.

In general the book is well arranged, the argumentation cogent, and the exposition lucid.

Brasenose College, Oxford

MAURICE PLATNAUER

THE BUDÉ THUCYDIDES

Thucydide: *livres VI et VII*. Texte établi et traduit par LOUIS BODIN et JACQUELINE DE ROMILLY. (Collection Budé.) Pp. xxxvi + 176; 2 maps. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper.

VOLUME IV of this edition, in which the work of the late Louis Bodin has been incorporated, revised, and completed by Mme de Romilly, naturally invites comparison with the Oxford text, and emerges on balance superior. It owes this superiority in part to a better choice between *vv.ll.*, including better use of the *recentiores*, in part to the adoption of conjectures in passages where the tradition, printed by the Oxford text, is unlikely to the point of absurdity.

I include in the former category: vi. 25. 2, H^{pe}; vi. 62. 5, H^{sl}; vi. 69. 3, H^{pe}, cf. Σ; vi. 104. 2, ACEFM; vii. 19. 5, HJK; vii. 25. 1, B; vii. 41. 4, Cordewener cl. Valla. To these we might reasonably add: vii. 40. 5, JK; vii. 77. 6, Reiske cl. Valla. An inadequate *v.l.*, however, is accepted in: vi. 15. 4, *διαθέντι* H^{pe} (only *διαθέντος*, reported by Krueger, really makes sense of this passage); vi. 20. 4, *ἀπαρχὴ ἐσφέρεται* S² (*ἀπαρχῆς φέρεται* codd.; the usage of *φέρειν* and *εἰσφέρειν* suggests *ἀπαρχὴ φέρεται*); vi. 23. 1, *πλεῖν γρ.* H (*πλήν* codd., which is satisfactory, for Nicias is contrasting the actual force already voted, *ναυτικῆς καὶ φαύλου στρατιᾶς*, with a hypothetical force which would be superior in all arms); vii. 70. 2, *οἱ ἄλλοι* ACEFM (a use of *ἄλλος* unexampled in Thucydides, despite innumerable opportunities). False inferences about the reading of Σ Patm. at vi. 27. 1 and of Σ^M at vi. 31. 3 are drawn in the app. crit.

The second category may be subdivided:

- (i) Virtually certain conjectures: vi. 4. 2, Stein; vi. 36. 2, Classen; vi. 65. 1, Acacius; vi. 82. 2, Herwerden; vi. 89. 6, Steup cl. Σ.
- (ii) Conjectures which, though not necessarily the right answer, make better sense than the tradition: vi. 40. 1, Cobet and Madvig (but Gomme's *εἰ <γὰρ> μὴ* is a neat and adequate solution of the difficulty); vi. 49. 4, Boehme; vi. 97. 1, Madvig (but is the result Greek? It is better to delete *τῇ ἐπιγιννομένη ἡμέρᾳ ἐξητάζοντο* as an intrusive explanation of *ταύτης*, and *καὶ* as patchwork); vii. 7. 3, Widmann (but why not delete *ὅπως ἂν* instead?); vii. 75. 6, Steup.
- (iii) Conjectures which are perhaps unnecessary but deal reasonably with a difficult and suspect tradition (most of Bodin's own conjectures come into this category): vi. 9. 2, Reiske; vi. 34. 1, Coraes; vi. 36. 3, Krueger; vi. 38. 4, Weil; vi. 83. 4, Marchant; vii. 57. 5, Lindau.

Against these we must set two unsatisfactory conjectures shared with the Oxford text: vi. 2. 5, *ἀνέστειλαν* Bekker (*ἀπέστειλαν* codd., which Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* i. 22. 2 seems to have read and misunderstood); vii. 49. 2, *αὐτοῦ*

Krueger (see Fraenkel on A. Ag. 1055). Several more were rightly rejected by the Oxford text: vi. 2. 1, ἤδη Haacke (ὥδε Ald. gives the required sense 'its original colonization was as I shall now describe'); vi. 6. 2, Λεοντίνων del. Classen (but only the presence of Λεοντίνων explains the remarkable position of οἱ Ἐγεσταῖοι; the point of their collocation is to emphasize that *Segesta* reminded Athens of the Athenian treaty with *Leontini*); vi. 18. 4, ἄρξωμεν ἢ κακώσωμεν Classen (but Alcibiades is prophesying excitedly); vi. 40. 1, τούτου Badham (which ruins the antithesis between τοῦτο μὲν ἂν and εἰ δ' ἄλλα βουλήσεσθε); vi. 53. 1, μὲν add. Hude (grammatically unnecessary); vi. 61. 5, τοῦ Bodin (τὸ codd., an example of τὸ μὴ for μῆc. inf. in co-ordination or antithesis); vi. 74. 1, οἱ ταῦτα βουλόμενοι del. Herwerden (but the reference of these words is not identical with that of οἱ δέ, and they are hardly conceivable as an interpolation); vi. 91. 7, ἐργαστηρίων Krueger (δικαστηρίων codd., which is explained by Lys. xvii. 3); vii. 36. 5, τῷ Dobree (but 67. 1, to which the supplementary note draws attention, justifies τό, and τό is in fact the reading of *P. Hamb.* 164); vii. 75. 4, ἐτι post ὀλίγων add. Bodin (which does nothing to solve the problem of ὀλίγων); vii. 77. 4, τοῦ θείου Krueger (but τοῦ θεοῦ on Nicias's lips is appropriate).

The tradition is kept, rightly, in vii. 4. 1, πρὸς τὸ ἐγκάρσιον (cf. πρὸς ὀρθήν Arist. *Meteor.* 373^{b2}), but rather surprisingly in vi. 31. 1, παρασκευὴ γὰρ αὕτη πρώτη (where the translation follows Marchant's wildly over-ingenious explanation); vi. 54. 5 οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρχὴν ἐπαχθὴς ἦν (Hude's emendation is mentioned in the note, but not Schwartz's); vi. 104. 2, κατὰ τὸν Τερναῖον κόλπον (the footnote suggests that κατὰ means 'level with', although on the other side of Italy); vii. 13. 2, τῶν ναυτῶν τῶν μὲν . . . ἀπολλυμένων (implying that the *θεράποντες*—a word denoting a function rather than a status—are part of οἱ ναῦται); *ibid.*, ἐπ' αὐτομολίας προφάσει (which can only mean 'giving desertion as their reason'); vii. 27. 4, ἐξ ἀνάγκης τῆς ἕτης φρουρᾶς καταθεούσης (in the note the problem of ἐξ ἀνάγκης is clearly perceived, and a case is almost made for τῆς ἕτης).

An editor of Thucydides is confronted with topographical problems of a rare complexity. It is notorious that no intelligible picture of the environs of Syracuse can be constructed until some passages are emended, that even then we cannot, on the evidence which Thucydides gives us, visualize the terrain as a whole, and that he writes at times as if his readers were already apprised of the existence of individual items (note the definite articles in vi. 98. 2, 99. 2, 100. 1). The Budé editors have emended sparingly, rejecting Rehm's ingenious explanations of vii. 4. 1 and 7. 1, and their Topographical Appendix is a good guide to the problems involved. I would still doubt the wisdom of their reversion to the traditional view that even before 415 the perimeter of Syracuse included the eastern end of the plateau. If it did, then the wall of 415/14 (vi. 75. 1), although it protected Temenites, cannot have made a serious contribution to the end for which it was designed, ὅπως μὴ δι' ἐλάσσονος εὐαποτειχιστοὶ ὦσιν. If, on the other hand, this wall ran north-south and for the first time linked the perimeter with the 'other sea', it was a military operation of the highest value; and its description as παρὰ πᾶν τὸ πρὸς τὰς Ἐπιπολὰς ὁρῶν, in the light of the statement (vi. 96. 2) that Epipolae was ἐπιφανὲς πᾶν ἔσω, does not conflict with this interpretation.

DOCUMENTS IN THUCYDIDES

CARL MEYER: *Die Urkunden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*. (Zetemata, Heft 10.) Pp. viii + 102. Munich: Beck, 1955. Paper, DM. 9.50.

KIRCHHOFF in his *Thukydides u. s. Urkundenmaterial* (1895, but first published in 1880) showed the way this problem should be treated; and though some of his particular conclusions were weak (as Steup demonstrated), his is still the best discussion. But after he wrote, the problem was bedevilled by two eminent scholars, Wilamowitz and Schwartz, who both started at the wrong end: they began by generalizing and then looked at the facts. They first asserted that all ancient historians were bound by certain laws of style, especially unity of style which forbade *any* of them who knew how to write to include *urkundliches Material* in its original form (with quotations from Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, and even those only show a refusal to give at full length already published *speeches*); then looked at Thucydides and exclaimed, 'he could not have put these documents in himself (nor even the quotations from poetry, in another style and another dialect)', 'he intended to rewrite in his own words'; and finally looked for the inconsistencies between document and narrative to prove the assertion. It is this unmethodical procedure which Dr. Carl Meyer, following his illustrious namesake Eduard Meyer, attacks in this excellent paper, with entire success; and, since his judgement is good, he has little difficulty as well in showing that most of the inconsistencies are not there, that the narrative implies the documents. Indeed at times he proves the obvious at unnecessary length, e.g. that *περὶ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας*, iv. 120. 1, does not refer directly to the last sentence of c. 119, but to the document of the truce itself; and in the interpretation of viii. 52, where grammar does not *require* that the subject of *ῥῆθετο* must be Alcibiades. (But the positive conclusion from this last, p. 84, is well put.)

Sometimes he presses an interpretation too finely, and thereby misses what is most significant. At viii. 57. 2 our manuscripts give *πάντων οὖν τούτων λογισμῷ καὶ προνοίᾳ, ὥσπερ ἐβούλετο ἐπανισοῦν τοὺς Ἕλληνας πρὸς ἀλλήλους, μεταπεμφάμενος οὖν τοὺς Πελοποννησίους τροφὴν τε αὐτοῖς δίδωσι καὶ σπονδὰς τρίτας ταύτας σπένδεται*. Wilamowitz said 'das doppelte οὖν zeigt doppelte Arbeit'. Not so, says Meyer; the second οὖν shows how Tissaphernes' action (*τροφὴν τε δίδωσι*, κ.τ.λ.) is explained by his desires (*ὥσπερ ἐβούλετο*, κ.τ.λ.). Perhaps; and this may justify the second οὖν, as Stuart Jones thought; but to Wilamowitz, whose feeling for Greek forbade him to accept in Thucydides an unexampled repetition after so short an interval, the proper answer is: Granted, but the *doppelte Arbeit* might have been separated by a very short space of time—Thucydides, after writing *μεταπεμφάμενος οὖν*, κ.τ.λ., may, a few days later only, have thought a rather longer explanation desirable and written *τούτων οὖν . . . ἀλλήλους* in the margin, intending to think further about it. And important conclusions follow: (1) the editor, that is, the man responsible for seeing that Thucydides' unfinished work was published, was so scrupulous, and so determined to preserve all that Thucydides wrote and not to introduce anything of his own, that he allowed an anomaly to remain; and (2) in consequence, since Thucydides (either because he had not yet seen the documents themselves, as Kirchhoff supposed, or because he would shudder at the thought of inserting them in his beautiful *History*) must have written, 'in

his o
dura
421,
to co
have
or af
as we
them
not t
In
ment
Mey
ment
since
say)
Plata
his d
histo

Univer

R. S
and

In th
the s
gener
divid
will i

Me
from
Plato
part,
tially
assur
have
to se
he ha
be a
and
that
fore
(agai
argui
if its
insist
and
selve
(99 e

his own style', some résumé of the terms of the truce of 423/2 (at least its duration and the names of the states which agreed to it) and of the peace of 421, to which, for example, v. 35. 4 and 92. 2, would refer—for he came near to completing his history of the Ten Years' War. These résumés would certainly have been preserved by the careful editor—we should have them now, before or after iv. 118-19 and v. 18-19—and the documents would have been inserted as well only if Thucydides had at least given some indication that he wanted them. Further, if there *were* already a stylistic law for Greek historians, it is not the cautious editor but the bold creative artist who would break it.

In some matters, most of them inessential to his main theme, e.g. his treatment of v. 20. 1 ('just ten years since the first invasion of Attica'), where I find Meyer's solution quite inadequate, I could find fault with him; and his argument from ii. 65. 6 ('Pericles survived the war by two and a half years') that, since Pericles died 'in either August or September (as E. Meyer and Beloch say)', *therefore* Thucydides' ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου was the Theban attack on Plataia, is no argument at all; but his book is one to be read, and not only for his discussion of principles, but for the details, whether of historiography or of history.

University of Glasgow

A. W. GOMME

THE PHAEDO

R. S. BLUCK: Plato's *Phaedo*. A Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. Pp. x+208. London: Routledge, 1955. Cloth, 21s. net.

In the expository parts of his work Mr. Bluck has made a solid contribution to the study of this difficult dialogue. The translation is very readable, and in general as lucid as the text will permit; after the example set by Cornford it is divided into sections, each prefaced by commentary. The following remarks will illustrate the scope of the work.

Mr. Bluck makes a new suggestion regarding 99 d ff.: that the 'transition' from λόγοι to ὑποθέσεις is the transition from the Socratic 'general term' to the Platonic separable Form-cause, and marks an acknowledgement, on Plato's part, of his debt to Socrates' doctrine, of which the theory of Forms is essentially a 'clarification'. It may be objected that the 'transition' begins with the assurance that the method of hypotheses represents 'nothing new'; the Forms have already appeared in the discussion, and a sudden concern on Plato's part to set out the stages of an historical development (which both here and earlier he has effectively concealed) seems unlikely. Moreover, a λόγος seems here to be a verbal representation of a 'common character' (whether separable or not) and an ὑπόθεσις is the mental correlate of such a character; it would appear that both words refer to the same objective entity, and the 'transition' has therefore no great significance. I am sure, however, that Bluck is right in holding (against R. Robinson) that the passage is not concerned primarily with ways of arguing from one proposition to another; it would be irrelevant to its context if its theme were logic and not 'the causes of generation and decay'. Bluck insists further that the λόγοι are not propositions but 'definitions or accounts', and that these 'definitions' are causes. Surely, however, they are not themselves causes but 'reflections' (εἰκόνες) in words of 'the truth of things' in general (99 e 6), referring as they do 'both to cause and to everything else' (100 a 5, 6).

They are therefore much akin to the hypotheses, which Bluck, rightly in my opinion (for his view accords with *Rep.* 596 a), describes as 'provisional notions' of Form-causes. Unlike Bluck, however, I should not exclude the possibility of putting λόγοι and ὑποθέσεις into propositional form: e.g. that such and such a group of particulars is caused by such and such a Form. (As a statement of an hypothesis, such a proposition needs examination since it will apparently be found that not every general or collective term implies the existence of a corresponding Form.) On this question it would have been at least politic to refer to two 'hypotheses' which are earlier expressed as propositions: 92 d, that learning is recollection, and 94 b, that soul is 'harmony'. The position is perhaps obscured by the translation 'premiss' at both these points. The discussion is somewhat impeded by a reluctance (due, I suppose, to Stenzel's influence) to ascribe to Socrates and Plato any high degree of ability to think abstractly and, in particular, to distinguish 'substance' and 'quality'. There seems to be some wavering on this point: on p. 177 Socrates 'came very close' to the modern meaning of 'universal'. But in any case a consideration of, for example, the degrees of abstraction implied by the neuter adjective with article, which fails to mention Thucydides, cannot be regarded as cogent. The special difficulty of regarding *relative* Forms as instances of themselves is also relevant here; it should have been noted that the Equal Itself, however 'substantial' it may be, must also be abstract in the extreme, since a solitary, non-abstract, 'equal thing' (equal to what?) is a baffling conception.

Bluck is concerned to defend the validity of the final argument ('incontrovertible' if soul is 'what gives life') and, in particular, of its final 'step'—the move from 'deathless' to 'imperishable'. Here I can merely report that he has not shaken my view that this last 'step' is intended to produce a merely formal completion of the answer to Cebes who had asked that the soul should be proved 'both deathless and indestructible' (88 b 5, 6). Bluck seems not to notice Socrates' awareness that the words for 'death' shift their meaning more than once in the dialogue. Death was first defined (67 d) as the separation of soul from body, so that in the 'cyclical argument' soul could exist 'in a state of deadness' (Bluck's translation); and this meaning recurs later, even after the revised definition, offered by Socates in his summary of Cebes' objection, that death is 'the destruction of the soul' (91 d 5, 6). It is, I suggest, the desire to cope with this persisting ambiguity which accounts for most of the difficulty found in 106 d, e.

Other topics which might give rise to lengthy discussion may be mentioned more briefly. I do not find in the text that Socrates absolutely condemned suicide as 'wicked' (see Archer-Hind on 61 c 4); nor is it laid down that death is always better than life (p. 162—*Gorg.* 512 a might have been cited here). Hence Bluck's solution of 62 a (it never happens that death is *only* sometimes better) seems unacceptable; in addition, it depends on the negation of 'only' which would certainly not have been omitted from the Greek in such a sentence. I do not understand the anxiety to deny the influence of the theory of Forms in dialogues earlier than *Phaedo*, or the view that before *Theaet.* 'phenomena are . . . not real at all' (p. 180), so that Forms are not immanent in particulars (p. 17; but what of *παρουσία, μέθεξις, κοινωνία*?). Even if it is 'Form-copies' which are immanent, they are surely not altogether illusory. And if sensible particulars are completely unreal why should they require to be explained by a theory of causality? Here there is an attempt to distinguish

eidos (Form) from *idéa* and *μορφή* ('Form-copy'); but it seems to be admitted that the distinction cannot fairly be deduced from the text. There is some confusion regarding the subject of *ὑπολαμβάνομεν* in 86 b which seems to be understood as 'we heretical Pythagoreans' or the like; the subject is rather 'people in general', and the usage finds a parallel even in Bluck's introduction (p. 33): 'Nowadays we think . . .—but by no means everyone does think so. 'Attunement' is not a satisfactory rendering of *ἁρμονία*; it obscures the fact that 'harmony' is found 'in all the works of craftsmen' (86 c 7), and may lead to misconceptions such as Taylor's statement that the 'tune' is 'given out' by the body. The presence of 'harmony' in the works of craftsmen is one indication that in 'harmony' (unlike soul) there are degrees of perfection. Bluck thinks that *Rep.* 349 e is against the interpretation that one 'harmony' can differ from another in degree; but the point there is merely that the musical man tunes a lyre better than the unmusical, so that the passage seems rather to be on my side. The appendix on 'Knowledge and the Senses' would have gained from a reference to *Rep.* 523–4, where the same apparent 'contradiction' appears as in *Phaedo*: the senses are necessary to knowledge, and yet a source of confusion.

Numerous points are raised by the translation; I offer the following samples. I regret the departure from Burnet's explanation at 58 e 1 (*παραγενόμενος* is not 'when I arrived'), at 60 b 1 (*ἀνακαθιζόμενος* is not 'sitting down'), and at 114 d (where at least 'take the risk of thinking' is clearly right). At 59 b 4 'very much distressed' cannot be right of the mixture of pleasure and grief (*ἐτεροπάγμην*). At 60 c 1, 2: *αὐτὰ* is not 'them' but 'the point mentioned' (so also *αὐτῶν*, 62 b 3), and 'to part them' seems in the context an unhappy version of *διαλλάξαι*. At 61 d Simmias and Cebes did not hear 'all' about it from Philolaus, who seems again let down rather gently by 'not very clearly' for *οὐδὲν γε σαφές*. At 62 b: the translation 'weighty doctrine' rather than 'lofty' or 'high-flown' (*μέγας*) conceals the difficulty that, if *φρουρά* means 'prison' and the prison is the body, Socrates here dissociates himself from a doctrine which he later seems to accept as a matter of course: At 66 b 4, why 'a narrow path' instead of 'a short-cut' (Burnet) for *ἀτραπός*? That the short-cut is death seems very likely in spite of (Burnet and) Bluck, who does not discuss the point. At 69 b 'bought and sold with (*μετά*) this': 'with' will be misunderstood as instrumental. The difficulty raised on p. 155 that the buyer decreases his stock of wisdom seems unreal; the right exchange is always that of less wise for wiser pleasures and pains. At 80 c 7, 8 if *συμπέσον* is 'withered', the following *καί* is 'or' not 'and'. At 92 a, b 'I don't suppose you will admit, though you say it yourself' is hardly intelligible for 'you will not allow yourself to say'. At 103 b 1, 'Thank you for reminding me' is a mistake; the verb *ἀπομνημονεύω* means 'remember', not 'remind'. The notes (pp. 135, 200) on the mythical earth are far from clear; and there is mention of a perpendicular which is by no means perpendicular in the diagram. There are some misprints, of which 'fears . . . is' (p. 104) is possibly one. I do not care for the expressions 'true facts' (p. 96), 'Quite' as an affirmative reply without accompanying adjective or adverb in the context, and 'How do you mean?'—*πῶς λέγεις*; is surely 'What do you mean?' as compared with *τί λέγεις*; which tends to mean 'What do you say?'

THE FRAGMENTS OF ARISTOTLE

W. D. Ross: *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*. (Script. Class. Bibl. Oxon.) Pp. x+160. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. Cloth, 18s. net.

WALZER's edition of the fragments of the dialogues of Aristotle (1934), gave us a valuable conspectus of the evidence concerning some of his lost writings; but the older collections of fragments by Rose and Heitz have not yet been revised in the light of modern research. The Oxford text now edited by Sir David Ross goes together with his translation of *Selected Fragments*, published in 1952. The passages are grouped under four headings: (1) Dialogues, (2) Logical Works, (3) Philosophical Works, and (4) Poems. The selection thus includes writings which have some philosophical or personal interest, but omits Aristotle's historical works and epistles, the genuineness of which is doubtful, and some writings on special scientific problems. In his Preface Sir David Ross touches briefly on the questions, which of the lost works were in Dialogue form? what can be said of their order of composition? and what is their value for the study of Aristotle's philosophy? A new critical text is not supplied, the text being taken from the most recent editions with a few emendations.

There is therefore much labour still left for the compiler of a complete edition. I think also that there are some improvements which might with advantage already have been made. The sequence of fragments in the longer writings, such as the *Protrepticus*, is an important matter, and I think the time has come to review the established order, which editors have taken over from one another since the time of Bywater and Rose. It is no doubt helpful not to disturb the numeration of fragments, but the final aim should be to recover the argument of the original. Now, for instance, fr. 10 (c), which refers to death and the prospect of immortality, is placed in front of fr. 12, which alludes to the Isles of the Blest. Yet it would be self-evident that the former was the peroration to the whole dialogue, even if we were not actually told that it came from the end of the *Hortensius*. The Isles of the Blest are only introduced, as in *Politics* 1334^a 28 ff., in the process of showing the superiority of contemplation to the active virtues. Again, editors have placed at the beginning (fr. 2) several passages relating to the argument: εἴτε φιλοσοφητέον, φιλοσοφητέον, εἴτε μὴ φιλοσοφητέον, φιλοσοφητέον. And no doubt this was the main theme of the dialogue. Yet it is obvious that this dilemma would only be produced in reply to such an attack on mathematics, and other theoretical study, as is delivered in the passage printed as fr. 5. And once more we know that this was Cicero's procedure, for *Ciceronis Hortensius contra philosophiam disserens circumvenitur arguta conclusione*, etc. (Lact. *Inst.* iii. 16). It may be added here that P. Merlan in his *From Platonism to Neo-Platonism* (1953) makes out a strong case for regarding Iamblichus *de comm. math. sc.* ch. 23, not hitherto considered a fragment of the *Protrepticus*, as part of Aristotle's answer to those who contest the value of mathematics. This new fragment might with advantage have been added.

I doubt whether the passages printed as fr. 5 and fr. 8 really constitute distinct fragments. Both say that the mathematical sciences have progressed with great rapidity, overtaking the practical arts, to which they 'gave a long start', because these were the first to be discovered or rediscovered after the deluge. (This seems to be the meaning of προεμένους . . . θέοντας παρεληλυθέναι, which Sir David Ross translates ' . . . have spent much on other branches of knowledge'.)

In fr. 8 it is merely added that all science seems to be nearing its completion, and that progress in mathematics has been made in the past not only in the absence of public encouragement, but in face of actual hindrance. The argument in frs. 5 and 8 is consecutive, and it is a pity that two others are made to intervene. Further, the reference to the absence of public rewards is meant to recall Plato, *Rep.* vii. 528 c. It may be questioned whether Aristotle himself made this allusion, or whether it has been tacked on to the *Protrepticus* passage by Iamblichus.

To this general remark I would add some criticisms of detail. *Protrepticus*. Among the testimonies we find (from Nonius s.v. *contendere*): *M. Tullius in Hortensio: magna enim animi contentio adhibenda est interpretando Aristotelem si legis.* (Walzer, however, prints this as . . . *in interpretando* . . . *si legis.*) Is there not something amiss with this passage, in view of the favourable comments which Cicero elsewhere makes on the fluency and 'copiousness' of Aristotle in contrast to the monosyllabic brevity of the Stoic writers? I would suggest that only the phrase down to *adhibenda est* is a quotation from Cicero, and that *si legis* is a corruption representing the Greek word which Cicero rendered by *animi contentio*, perhaps *συμρόνωσις* which can be found in *Protr.* fr. 5. If so, this passage should be removed from the Testimonies.

Politicus. The heading should be Testimonium, since only one passage follows; so also on pp. 96 and 120. On pp. 66-67, the word *ἀναμαρτήτους* seems to refer not to the *Politics* passage which is quoted, but to *Protr.* fr. 4, p. 30 above. *On Poets*. Fr. 3, p. 69: it is hardly fair to print *πρότερον γραφέντας* in the text without a critical note. *On Philosophy*. P. 73, *testimonia*: the emendations *de caelo* and *de mundo* should obviously be made. Fr. 16, p. 84: another version of this argument seems to be preserved in Albinus, *Isagoge*, ed. Hermann, p. 165, lines 33 ff., where we have a proof that God is unchanging and incorporeal. Fr. 27, pp. 94-95: only one passage, Cicero, *Tusc.* i. 10, is given in which Aristotle is represented as calling the soul *ἐνδελέχεια*. Other passages have been found which confirm this, and these might be added to show that Cicero is not in error. *On Justice*. Fr. 6, p. 99: this passage of Themistius seems to be only an embroidered version of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. *On Ideas*. Pp. 120-1: the distinction between testimony and fragments here is arbitrary. Indeed, the sole passage printed as a testimony is merely a Latin version of the last of those printed under the heading fr. 1. Lastly, in the comparative table on pp. 149-50, the date of Rose's second edition (that in vol. v of the Berlin Aristotle) should be 1870, not 1831; and the word *Trans.* has been copied into the table in error.

University of Edinburgh

D. J. ALLAN

THE PARVA NATURALIA

W. D. Ross: Aristotle, *Parva Naturalia*. A revised text with introduction and commentary. Pp. xi+356. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. Cloth, 40s. net.

THE sight of this book will stir the expectations of all readers of Aristotle, for it stands in line with those great editions of the *Metaphysics*, the *Physics*, and the *Analytics*. The form is similar: a long introduction, text with apparatus criticus,

conspectus of the contents, summary and commentary by chapters, and indexes in Greek and English. The style too is familiar, and Sir David Ross must allow his admirers their rather esoteric pleasure in recognizing the well-known marks: 'That is why people in a fever, on the basis of a small resemblance in the lines on the walls, see these as animals' (p. 46); 'He next offers an interesting classification of odours' (p. 26). There is the same lucidity in exposition—that systematic lucidity which Aristotle himself first introduced into philosophy and which is the first requirement for understanding him. Ross has for so long been the model for British Aristotelian scholarship that the reviewer's immediate reaction is a mood of acceptance and admiration.

This form of book was outstandingly successful in the three earlier examples. Nevertheless, now that we see the method applied to a work of scientific rather than philosophical speculation, we find that there are flaws in it. Ross's introduction, after a discussion of the chronology of the *Parva Naturalia*, takes each treatise in turn and analyses its contents chapter by chapter. At the other end of the book we have a summary of each chapter followed by a commentary. This means that we sometimes have to read the book in four places at once. Moreover, the analysis in the introduction sometimes merely paraphrases the summary, which is also, if necessary, expanded or reproduced in the commentary (see, for instance, the treatment of 445^b3–20 on pp. 27, 217, and 219–20). One cannot help feeling that this is wasteful. The introduction might well have been confined to general problems; the summary is so nearly a translation that it might have been better to acknowledge it as a translation and print it with the Greek text on opposite pages, with the commentary kept for the end.

The first section of the introduction deals with chronology. Here Ross is indebted to Dr. E. Nuyens's *L'Évolution de la psychologie d'Aristote*, the results of which he summarizes, with some additional evidence. He adopts Dr. Nuyens's three evolutionary periods: (1) the period of the dialogues, in which Aristotle advanced little beyond Plato's *Phaedo*; (2) a period when soul is regarded as common, in some way, to all animals and is closely connected with parts of the body, particularly the heart; and (3) the period when Aristotle held the view, explained in the *De Anima*, that soul is the *ἐντελέχεια* of the body.

Ross agrees with Nuyens that the *De Juventute* (including the *De Respiratione*) belongs to the second period, but he doubts Nuyens's view that the first five treatises belong to the last period. To decide the problem one must look at the details of the evidence, but one may point out a general difficulty to which the present reviewer gives more weight than Ross evidently does. This method of dating Aristotle's works depends on the tendency of his language to suggest either a two-substance theory of body and soul, in the early period, or a one-substance theory, in the late period. But it is hard to be consistent in using language appropriate to a one-substance theory; Aristotle reminded himself of the difficulty when he wrote these words (which might, incidentally, have served as a text for Professor Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*): βέλτιον γὰρ ὕσως μὴ λέγειν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐλεεῖν ἢ μανθάνειν ἢ διανοεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῇ ψυχῇ (*De Anima* 1. 408^b14).

One could say with justice that Aristotle's ordinary language shows a natural bias towards a two-substance theory. But Ross would include the *De Sensu* in the second period, on the ground that a two-substance theory is indicated when Aristotle describes sense-perception as being one of the *κοινὰ τῆς τε ψυχῆς καὶ*

τοῦ σώματος (as he often does). What would he have written in the later period? Perhaps οὐκ ἄνεν σώματος, as in *De Anima* 429^{b5}—but in *De Anima* 433^{b20} he says ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς ἔργοις. I do not think Aristotle's language is so consistently accurate that we can use such phrases as evidence.

There is another complication which Ross leaves out of account. He sometimes calls the second period 'the biological period', and (e.g. in a list on p. 12) without comment includes in it the *De Generatione Animalium*. Nuyens puts this work in the last period, for excellent reasons. This is awkward, because the *De Gen. An.* seems to know of the ἐντελέχεια doctrine of the soul (e.g. 738^{b27}), and yet it locates sensation in the heart (743^{b26} ff.) in a way reminiscent of the second period. For these reasons Ross has not convinced me that the *De Sensu* is earlier than parts of the *De Anima* or that the whole of the *Parva Naturalia* was necessarily written before the ἐντελέχεια doctrine was worked out. Nuyens's view that only the *De Juventute* is earlier may still be the right one.

The text is based on a careful study of the manuscripts, including a new collation of five manuscripts. Former editors have usually preferred one or the other of the two groups into which the manuscripts are classified, but Ross chooses between the two according to the reading offered by Alexander or the independent manuscript P, or according to his own judgement. There are also about thirty-six new emendations. The excellence of Ross's treatment of the text can be seen particularly in the jumble of letters attached to Aristotle's diagram in 452^{a17-b7} (though the situation is obscured by misprints in the app. crit.; see below).

The great merits of this edition lie especially in the detailed interpretation of difficult passages. It would be tedious, however, to list the dark places into which Ross brings fresh light (for an example, see the discussion of imperceptible magnitudes in *De Sensu* 448^{a19} ff.), and at the risk of being accused of φιλονεικία (see Aristotle, *De Philosophia* fr. 10 W) the reviewer must draw attention to a few points where Ross's exposition has not convinced him.

Ross accepts Dr. Lulofs's arguments for retaining *De Insomniis* 459^{b23-460^{a26}}—a passage suspected by Biehl. There may be more to be said, but on the arguments so far presented Biehl's view is more persuasive.

A complicated section of *De Sensu* (445^{b3-11}) was wrongly interpreted by Alexander—so Ross, in his commentary ad loc.; a full discussion is needed to prove the point, but I think Alexander was right; crucial to this is 445^{b20} περὶ δὲ τῆς λύσεως αὐτῶν . . ., which Ross takes as 'the refutation of the atomic theory' in the summary and notes, and—with Alexander, rightly—as 'the solution of the question he has propounded' in the introduction (p. 27).

In the note to 461^{b26-30}, I do not understand 'if it is not affected by the inrush [of blood, it concludes] . . . "Coriscus must be here"'; if this is a correct conclusion, the man must be awake; but if so, what is the inrush of blood, which I took to be the cause of *sleep*?

In the note to 464^{b2}, the amulet referred to is sixth century A.D.; here the summary says 'mad people are good at repeating Philaenis' poems'; it should be 'like Philaenis' poems, mad people too . . .'

The following list of minor *corrigenda* may be useful. P. 16, last line: for 'by nature' read 'earlier'.¹ P. 19, line 33: for 'light' read 'sight'. P. 64, line 29: for '438^{a10}' read '438^{a1}'; line 31: for 'ἀρριγῶτατον' read 'ἀρριγότατον'. 446^{b27-28} note: for '*De An.*' read '*De Sensu*'. 450^{a30} app. crit.: read 'τὸ πάθος

¹ This correction was kindly supplied by the author, in answer to my question.

seclusi'. 451^a8 summary: for 'Antiphon' read 'Antiphéron'. 452^a19 app. crit.: for 'E Smyly' read 'EF Smyly'; 452^a22 app. crit.: for 'Γ Smyly' read 'F Smyly'; and p. 247, line 27: for 'ἐπὶ τὸ E' read 'ἐπὶ τὸ F'. 452^b13 app. crit.: between 'νοῦ' and '13' insert 'Freudenthal'. 452^b13-22 summary (last line): for 'ZH' read 'ZA'. 460^b30 app. crit.: for 'ὑπάρχουσιν' read 'ὑπαρχουσῶν' (?—see note ad loc.). 468^b32: read 'Μέρη'. P. 316, line 5: for 'water' read 'air'.

To conclude with such a list might leave a wrong impression. This is by far the best edition of the *Parva Naturalia*, and a fine contribution to Aristotelian studies. We look forward to Sir David Ross's next book with eager anticipation.

University College, London

D. J. FURLEY

THE MEANING OF ΦΥΣΙΣ

D. HOLWERDA: *Commentatio de vocis quae est φύσις vi atque usu praesertim in graecitate Aristotele anteriore*. Pp. vii + 142. Groningen: Wolters, 1955. Paper, fl. 6.90.

THIS is an important book, all the more useful since it enables the reader to make up his own mind on many points by displaying *in extenso* an ample sufficiency of the some 1,500 passages (listed in the Index) which are the basis of Dr. Holwerda's classification. His method is thus more tentative and empirical than that of those earlier students of the word whom he criticizes for excessive and premature philosophizing. He finds that its main uses conform to the meanings of the verb 'to be' (copulative and existential) rather than 'to grow' or 'to become'. A much smaller class of instances where the meaning is 'growth' (Heidel, Heinimann) or 'origin' (Beardslee) or material 'stuff' of generation (cf. Burnet) is ascribed to the more or less conscious association of φ. with φύειν and φύεσθαι, but does not represent the primary (or even the primitive) sense. Here he agrees with G. S. Kirk (*Heraclitus: The Cosmic Fragments*, pp. 228-9), who is quoted also in support of the view that etymology (to which a short chapter is devoted) offers no objection to the interpretation of φν- as 'to be'. Holwerda stresses that he is not writing a history of the concept of nature, for which nevertheless he provides essential materials. It is perhaps for this reason that some of his distinctions seem superficial, and there is no discussion of such passages as *Laws* 891-2 (inadequately classified under the meaning γένεσις).

The subdivisions of his first class (the 'copulative') are very numerous: φ. refers to all sorts of predications including *what* a thing is (hence it is conjoined with οὐσία and λόγος in *Phaedrus* 245 e), its behaviour, size, genus (collective or abstract), qualities (so that φ. with neuter gen. sing. is one way of expressing an abstraction, as in *Phileb.* 44 e). It is applied also to age, sex, status (natural or legal), manner of life (as Herodotus ii. 68. 1) whether inborn or acquired by custom (νόμος), internal impulses, external influences, and so forth. By no means all of these compartments contain genuinely distinct senses of φ. The specific 'meaning' is sometimes provided by the context (as 'mortality' in *Lysias* ii. 77, 80, or 'loci natura' where the Greek has φ. τοῦ τόπου, or 'in universum' for φύσει where πάντες or the like is present in the context). Again, if φ. means 'natural impulses' it has not a separate meaning for every object of

these impulses. It is the context which invests the word with such apparently contrary 'meanings' as power and weakness, beauty and ugliness, though Holwerda seems to think differently, as at *O.T.* 335 where he translates ϕ . as 'moles informis' (which can scarcely be correct). Perhaps he is too reluctant to recognize any very general sense of ϕ ., such as 'the regular order of nature' (L.S.J.), though it is acknowledged that ϕ . often means the 'normal' or 'customary' condition or position of things. By contrast, the context seems to be neglected at *Od.* x. 303 where 'appearance' is inappropriate since Odysseus needed to be told, not the appearance of the herb (he was not required to look for it), but its properties.

The 'existential' head is rather more helpful, comprising such meanings as 'possibility' ($\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\upsilon\nu \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota = \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, *Rep.* 473 c), 'reality', 'truth' (Thuc. vi. 17. 1, Plato, *Laws* 682 a, Dem. xviii. 144) and, in the concrete sense, 'everything that exists', 'the cosmos' (under which head are placed, rather superficially, *Phaedo* 103 b and *Rep.* 597-8). In many of these passages the accepted rendering 'nature' is declared to be 'false'; thus at *Phaedo* 87 e the point is held to be 'real' rather than 'natural' weakness. The meaning 'revera' is accepted for $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ at *Rep.* 515 c (cf. Adam, ad loc.) and elsewhere. A weakened sense ('indeed') which Holwerda finds with conditional and concessive participles seems more doubtful: for example, $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\upsilon\nu \omicron\iota\kappa\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha$ ($\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$) at *Rep.* 428 e is rendered 'fac eam conditam esse'—but if a city is to be wise it is not enough for it to be merely founded. (Holwerda has perhaps unconsciously imported an article with $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$.) Still more doubtful is the suggestion that $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ can have the sense of a mere $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$; this is certainly not proved by quoting passages (p. 95) where $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ occurs in the same sentence. Another interesting but dubious suggestion (based on certain scholia) is that $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ can mean $\lambda\iota\alpha\nu$, $\sigma\phi\acute{o}\delta\rho\alpha$, or the like; examples are *Phileb.* 14 d 1 (ϕ . πολλούς, 'very many'), *Phaedo* 88 a (with οὕτω), *Rep.* 538 a (with πανύ) and 428 e ('longe'—with a superlative). As at *O.T.* 335 (*supra*) the 'periphrastic' use of ϕ . (cf. Jebb, ad loc.) is in general denied, e.g. at *Agam.* 633 ('earth's brood') and *Phaedrus* 251 b, where $\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon \phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ seems rightly taken as 'the root of the wing' rather than as a periphrasis for 'plumage'.

University of Sheffield

J. TATE

A NEW EDITION OF ACHILLES TATIUS

EBBE VILBORG, Achilles Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, i.) Pp. xci+191. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1955. Paper, Kr. 25.

DURING the last thirty years new editions have provided surer foundations for the texts of four of the five extant Greek romances; Vilborg's edition performs the same function for the *Leucippe and Clitophon*.

In the introduction Vilborg gives a full description of the three papyri and the twenty-three manuscripts known to him, surveys the history of the text, and explains the principles on which he has edited it. He finds that only ten manuscripts (four complete and six to a varying degree incomplete) need to be considered since the remainder are directly copied from them. On the basis of common errors he, like H. Dörrie (*De Longi Achillis Tatii Heliodori memoria*, Göttingen, 1935), refers all the manuscripts to a single medieval archetype.

Dörrie derives them all from two sub-archetypes, but Vilborg postulates, in addition to these two (α and β), a third sub-archetype to account for Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 627 (= F) which, in the part of the romance that it contains (i. 1–iv. 4), not only supports α and β to an almost equal extent but also provides some two hundred readings which belong to neither.

Vilborg rightly dismisses the hypothesis first put forward by Salmasius that the variants preserved in the medieval manuscripts indicate that two versions of the romance are represented. The question of two ancient versions arises again, however, in connexion with Ox. Pap. 1250 (II^1). Vilborg states that 'none of the papyri hitherto found represents the same branch as the archetype of our medieval manuscripts'. So far as the readings are concerned, whether of II^1 or of the more fragmentary II^2 and II^3 , this statement is hardly justifiable. The variants are indeed numerous, but they are mostly trivial and had they appeared in a medieval manuscript Vilborg would not, I think, have dissociated that manuscript from the archetype that he postulates for the others. But the reshaping of the narrative in II^1 is more curious. The fragment opens with ii. 7. 7 ($\delta\epsilon\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$), proceeds with ii. 8, ii. 2 (substituting for the first sentence of that chapter $[\epsilon]\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu\ [\delta]\mu\omicron\iota\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$), ii. 3. 1–2, ii. 9, breaking off with the words $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \delta\tau\iota$ in section 3 of that chapter. The effect of this arrangement is to turn what in the manuscripts amounts to a description of two separate dinner parties into a description of one party. Vilborg appears to believe that the papyrus gives the authentic text and that the text of the manuscripts does not represent another ancient version of the romance, but results merely from the misplacement of a leaf in the model from which the medieval archetype was copied. In that case he should surely have followed the papyrus notwithstanding the difficulties to which he calls attention. On the other hand, it is perhaps as well that he did not have the courage of his convictions, because they seem in fact to be ill-founded.

There are no good reasons for suspecting the narrative as given by the manuscripts. The only difficulty lies in the transitional phrase which concludes Book i— $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \eta\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu\ \delta\mu\omicron\iota\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$. This phrase is quite out of place, but its inappropriateness has nothing to do with the different accounts of the dinner parties. It is inappropriate because it is immediately followed not by a description of a dinner party at all, but by a scene in which Leucippe in her own room plays the harp as predicted a few lines earlier ($\eta\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\eta\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\ \psi\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \kappa\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\ \delta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota$). Jacobs removed the offending phrase as an interpolation, and it might indeed be derived from the beginning of ii. 9 ($\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\iota\pi\acute{\nu}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \eta\eta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\nu\ \delta\mu\omicron\iota\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$). But although the repetition of phrases in wrong places (with minor adaptations to suit them to new settings) is a not uncommon fault of scribes, for this particular repetition there seems to be no conceivable reason. I suggest that there was no deliberate repetition, but that the scribe of the medieval archetype or of a manuscript from which it was derived, either because there was a misplacement of leaves in his model or simply by inadvertence, passed straight from the closing words of Book i to the opening words of ii. 9, and on discovering the omitted passage or realizing his mistake proceeded to copy that passage without deleting the sentence that he had previously transcribed from ii. 9. Dörrie (loc. cit.) and C. F. Russo (*Acc. Naz. dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche* ser. viii, vol. x, fasc. 5–6, 1955) show conclusively that apart from the inappropriate transitional phrase

the narrative not only is consistent with itself but conforms in detail to what precedes. The narrative as given by *Π*¹, on the other hand, introduces both temporal inconsistencies and expressions which are alien to the usage of Achilles Tatius (see Russo, loc. cit.). Russo thinks that the papyrus may represent an abbreviated version of the romance; it is perhaps more likely that the papyrus never contained more than excerpts and that the rearrangement of this passage was designed by the excerptor to consolidate and simplify the material that he used.

Vilborg's object has been 'to reach a text as near as possible to the archetype' (p. lxxxv). It is not clear whether he means the medieval archetype or the author's original text; but although for a few passages there is evidence independent of the medieval manuscripts (citations in other authors as well as the papyri), for most of the romance the tradition cannot be traced beyond the medieval archetype. The readings of this archetype cannot be determined with certainty. The extant manuscripts do not include a manuscript which stands out as particularly reliable; all but F fall into two divergent groups of approximately equal merit, and the peculiar readings of F, if Vilborg's assessment is correct, result more often from Byzantine interpolation than from more accurate representation of the archetype. In these circumstances Vilborg is right to be eclectic. Analysis of the readings offered by the two main families has led him to think that when they are at variance β is right more often than α ; when therefore each family offers a possible reading he tends to follow β unless α has the support of F; but if a reading given by α , with or without the concurrence of F, is in his view clearly superior to a reading given by β , he does not hesitate to accept it.

The main weakness of his text is in those passages which are also preserved by papyri, for he pays more respect to the papyri than they deserve. Other things being equal he tends to follow *Π*¹, having persuaded himself that of the forty-six variants that he lists seventeen are superior and only seven inferior to the readings offered by the manuscripts. I would grant *Π*¹ $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$. τὸν γάρ for τότε γὰρ τὸν (ii. 2. 1), τρέφει and μαζ[οῖ] for φέρει and ἄμαξα (ii. 2. 3), βότρυος for βοτρυῶν (ii. 2. 5), ὁ μὲν οὖν οἶνος for ὁ μὲν οὖν (ii. 2. 6), τῶν βοτρυῶν πλησίον for τῶν βοτρυῶν (ii. 3. 2), προτίθηναι for προστίθηναι (ii. 9. 1), and προσέειπεν for προσέειπεν (ii. 9. 2); and I would also accept in that section ἐπετήρ[η]σα and adopt later in the sentence the text of the papyrus as supplemented by Grenfell and Hunt in preference to ἐπιτηρήσας of the manuscripts and Vilborg's subsequent emendation. But against these nine acceptable readings I see not seven but at least sixteen places where the readings offered by all or some of the manuscripts seem to me to be unquestionably superior to the readings of the papyrus, and in cases of apparent equality I would therefore follow the manuscripts rather than the papyrus, including among cases of equality two cases in ii. 3. 1 cited by Vilborg as examples to the credit of *Π*¹—φιλοτιμούμενος and παρέθηκε τὸν (MSS.), φιλοφρονούμ[εν]ος and παρε[θ]ήκατο (*Π*¹).

In his attitude to *Π*¹ Vilborg, it is true, follows Gaselee; but Gaselee assumed, in the absence of other evidence, that this papyrus (third to fourth century A.D.) was more or less contemporary with the author, whereas Vilborg believes, from the discovery of Pap. Mediolanensis (*Π*²), that the romance must have been written at least a hundred years earlier. Vilborg's predisposition to follow *Π*¹ is of course partly due to his belief that *Π*¹ alone preserves the true order of the narrative at the beginning of Book ii; but he should have observed that

his explanation of the 'disorder' in the manuscripts throws no light on the comparative merits of the manuscripts and *Π*¹ in general, and that whatever the real reason may be for the different arrangement of the narrative, the papyrus contains at least one error (*Χεῖον ἐκλευκον* for *Χῖον τὸν ἐκ Λακαίωνης* at ii. 2. 2) which smacks of interpolation and is a much more significant divergence than any of the acceptable readings (cited above) of which the manuscript variants are easy transcriptional corruptions.

Examples of falsifications of the text which Vilborg has adopted from *Π*¹ are: at ii. 2. 2 and 4 *ποιμένα* for *βοῦκόλον* (there is no plausibility in the theory that in a passage of less than 200 words in all Achilles Tatius would have referred to the protagonist as *ποιμήν* and *βοῦκόλος* alternately; ii. 2. 3 shows that a cowherd, not a shepherd, is in point); at ii. 3. 1 the insertion of *πολυτελῇ* after *τοῦ θεοῦ* (who will believe that *πολυτελῇ* is not ineptly derived from the preceding *πολυτελέστερα*?); at ii. 7. 7 *καί* for *μή* (*μή* is surely preferable whether it is taken as introducing a second prohibition asyndetically or as meaning 'lest'; cf. v. 19. 3); at ii. 8. 1 the insertion of *εἶχεν* after *ἡ δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως* (a verb, so far from being 'almost necessary', is out of place in the structure; *ἔχουσα* might stand, but nothing is wanted); *ibid.* the omission of *ἐρασῇ* before *γλυκύ* (the particular, not the general, is plainly needed); at ii. 8. 2 *καὶ ἐκπέμπουσαι κάτω τὴν ἡδονὴν ἔλκουσι τὰς ψυχὰς ἄνω πρὸς τὰ φιλήματα* (the manuscripts are here divided, but none of them has *ἐκπέμπουσαι, κάτω, or ἄνω*; I have little doubt that this is a passage where *α* preserves the truth—*καταπέμπουσι κατὰ τῶν στέρνων τὴν ἡδονὴν καὶ ἔλκουσι τὰς ψυχὰς πρὸς τὰ φιλήματα*).

The bulk of the text, edited on the basis of the medieval manuscripts, is generally readable and defensible even if it cannot be regarded as definitive. Although the tradition has often been suspected without much reason, there are not a few passages where it is certainly or probably at fault. Vilborg records many more conjectures than he adopts. He himself contributes few, and of those admitted to the text it is easier to believe that some are wrong (e.g. *οὖν* at i. 16. 9, *ἐγγέγραπτο* at iii. 6. 3, *ἀνάγκη δ' ἦν* at iii. 24. 3, *μου* at iv. 17. 1, *αὐτῇ ἦν* at vi. 10. 2, *κατακρατοῦντες* at viii. 14. 6) than that any is right. But, though none concerns a point of much importance, his conjectures at i. 6. 4 (*εἰς οἶαν* for *οἶαν εἰς*), i. 15. 5 (*τὸ ἄνω* for *ὁμοῦ*), iv. 11. 4 (*εἰς τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ Δέλτα ποιοῦντες* for *εἰς τὰ σχήματα Δέλτα ποιῶν* with a transposition), viii. 6. 5 (*καταφέρει* with Salmasius's *ἔστε* for *καταφέρων ἐς τόν*) seem to improve the text, and at viii. 8. 1 *ἔστιν ὧν* for *μεθ' ὧν*, though it has little palaeographical probability, affords a simpler treatment of a difficult problem than has hitherto been suggested.

Lest readers should infer from my criticisms that this book has more faults than virtues, I conclude by saying that in my opinion it is the best edition of Achilles Tatius that has yet appeared. The text differs from and improves upon those of the nineteenth-century editions of Jacobs, Hirschig, and Hercher and that of Gaselee's Loeb edition, principally because Vilborg normally rejects the peculiar readings of F, on which the text of the first four books as printed by Jacobs and his successors was largely based, and because he excludes the atticizing influence of Cobet which is so apparent in the editions of Hirschig and Hercher; and his clear and comprehensive presentation of the evidence is in itself an achievement which will earn the gratitude of any future workers in the field, even if I am right in suggesting that his interpretation of the evidence is sometimes at fault. I now look forward to the publication of his commentary

which may indeed remove, or at any rate modify, the doubts to which I have given expression.

Trinity College, Cambridge

R. M. RATTENBURY

THE HIBEH PAPYRI

E. G. TURNER and M.-TH. LINGER: *The Hibeh Papyri*, Part ii. Edited with translation and notes. Pp. xiv+187; 4 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1955. Cloth and boards, £6. 6s. net.

FIFTY years ago Grenfell and Hunt published the first volume of *The Hibeh Papyri*, made up wholly of papyri from the third century B.C. The second volume contains a further selection of Ptolemaic papyri with a sprinkling of Roman and Byzantine papyri. The major part is made up of the first season's finds at El-Hibeh, and, since the Ptolemaic documents whose provenance is definitely Oxyrhynchus heavily outnumber the others, there is a strong presumption that the literary texts also originate from Oxyrhynchus.

Among these thirty-six literary pieces are several new classical fragments. **172** is a poetical onomasticon or list of poetical epithets, all compound adjectives grouped roughly according to elements of their formation or meaning, not alphabetically. As not all the words are cited in the nominative masculine singular, gender and case, together with metrical values and dialect forms, may offer a clue to the source of the citation. Choral and tragic lyric, as well as epic, are drawn upon, and the fact that one in four of the words is new reminds us how much Greek poetry is lost. The text, possibly an extract from Philetas' dictionary, also illuminates the techniques of Alexandrian poets. It forms an interesting contrast to **175**, parts of a lexicon arranged alphabetically in order of the first two letters, usually with a gloss on each line. **173** is a comparison of Archilochus and Homer, citing alternately a line of each. **174**, dated, unlike the great majority of the texts, to the second century B.C., is said to be of fourth-century authorship in view of the occurrence in it of the heading χοροῦ μέλος and is tentatively identified with the *Hector* of Astydamas; similarly, **179**, comprising seven separate fragments otherwise consistent with a satyr play in vocabulary and style, could be compared to P. Hib. i. 3, commonly identified with Sophocles, *Tyro*—but there are objections to both identification and comparison. **182**, consisting of about forty scraps, some of which can be re-assembled, narrates the story about Socrates and Xanthippe condensed in Diog. Laert. ii. 34 and then goes on to discuss various practical and moral problems; it probably belongs to the genre known as *Ἀποφθέγματα* and is markedly Cynic in tone. **183**, in five fragments, is an analysis of poetic diction as part of a larger work on poetry, possibly ascribable to Theophrastus or Heraclides Ponticus, though there are internal objections to the latter. Ctesias' *Indica* is suggested as a possible origin of the ethnographical fragment **185**, a description of the *ὀνομαστὰ καὶ ἀξιόλογα* to be found among an unnamed people. Also worth noticing are the possibility that the capitals A and B in the left-hand margin of **180** stand as signs for characters (cf. Terence, *Bembinus*), the use of prodelision in **184**, and Webster's suggestion (**181**) that *Ἀνάσας ποτάμιος* may be an eel.

The most important Ptolemaic document is undoubtedly **198**, a series of *προστάγματα* or royal ordinances datable to the later years of Philadelphus or

the reign of Euergetes. Out of over a hundred fragments of a roll a sequence of six columns on recto and five on verso has been established. The ordinances regulate details of royal administration, the recto being concerned especially with the day-to-day conduct of affairs, the verso with the misbehaviour of officials, and special procedure for the exercise of jurisdiction in cases of abuse. This copy was probably made for the use of a guard-post on the Nile somewhere between Memphis and Hermopolis; it is a valuable addition to our knowledge of the Ptolemaic legislation and penal system and offers new evidence on certain points, e.g. the jurisdiction of the strategus, who is shown well on the way to becoming principal officer of the nome at a date earlier than Bengtson has led us to expect. The information about police-organization may now be collated with that amassed in P. Kool's dissertation on the *φυλακῖται*, as may also 203, a draft for a petition seeking redress against an *ἀρχιφυλακίτης*. 196 apparently lays down the duties or qualifications of the *γυναικονόμος*. 197 mentions a novel procedure described as *ἐπίκρισις γῆς ἢ οἰκιῶν*. 199 confirms the inference of Grenfell and Hunt that the cult of Philadelphus and Arsinoe was established in Alexandria by 272/1 B.C. at the latest. 200 is an amusing eye-witness account of a fracas between two women, probably *ἐταῖραι*. *εὐδαιμονισμός* (202) seems to mean 'wake', *ἀντέντευξις* (203) 'subpoena', *παραλαμβάνειν* (204) 'employ', not its usual technical sense, *παιδίσκαι* and *παιδάρια* (207) 'servants', not 'slaves'; *κυνστάφος* and *λυχνόδοτος* (213) are new designations of temple-servants, and *τὸ μουσικόν* (214) probably indicates the 'musical' side of the festivals concerned.

Of the Roman and Byzantine documents, 215, establishing that Tiberius Julius Alexander's promotion to praetorian prefect was subsequent to his prefecture of Egypt, has already been utilized by Turner in his fascinating reconstruction of Alexander's career in *J.R.S.* xlv; 216 apparently had its dating-formula corrected after Geta's murder; 217 offers evidence for the functioning of the *ἀρχιερέις* as quasi-municipal official and additional evidence for the city *ταμίας*. *δειοβολοῦν(α) τὴν βωλοστροφίαν* in 282 merits fuller discussion: *δειοβολέω* is surely the same word as *διβολέω*, which L.S.J. translates 'harrow' (cf. *P.S.I.* 422 where *καταβάλλειν διβολοῦντες* = 'break down by harrowing' *pace* Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*). The process of breaking down, or up, the soil was normally done after the clods had been thrown up by the plough (= *βωλοστροφία*), and oxen were employed in it. So *μονοβολεῖν* may just possibly refer to manual, i.e. single-handed, hoeing or, perhaps, harrowing done with a single beast. But the etymology of these and like terms clearly needs expert examination.

This is not a uniformly exciting volume but it contains some literary and documentary papyri of quite exceptional interest, makes many useful additions to our knowledge of Ptolemaic administration, and is a model of editorial thoroughness.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

B. R. REES

THE MICHAÏLIDIS PAPYRI

D. S. CRAWFORD: *Papyri Michaelidae*. Edited with introduction and notes. Pp. xiii + 166; 4 plates. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press (for the Egypt Exploration Society), 1955. Cloth, 52s. 6d. net.

WHEN David Crawford was killed in the rioting in Cairo in 1952, he had

already completed the manuscript of his edition of Mr. Michailidis's papyri; economic circumstances subsequently preventing its publication in Egypt, it was revised and seen through the press by Sir Harold Bell and Professor E. G. Turner, and its publication in this country sponsored by the Egypt Exploration Society. Such additions as the editors have seen fit to make have been sparingly inserted and clearly indicated, so that the edition remains Crawford's work and retains throughout the stamp of his personality.

The contents vary considerably in character and date. Six pieces may be classed as literary, among them a fragment from Chariton's romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, and another from *Iliad* xxiii, in which a regular system of punctuation is employed, elision being marked with fair consistency and accents liberally inserted. On the fifty-four papyrus documents a few observations must suffice. Examination of Plate iii shows that the editors are justified in their suspicion of some of the readings and their hesitation to draw hasty conclusions from the text of 7 as it stands: add that the use of *εἰς* cited by Crawford means rather 'to the credit of' and is certainly not a parallel for what he reads here. Plate iii suggests too that *Μυγῶτες* or *Μυλῶτες* should be read in 10. 1, *αργ* or *αργ* (not *αργ*) in line 6, and *Αὐ(τ)ο(υ)κράτ(ο)ρος* in line 4. In 15 (Plate iv) there seems to be a trace of an iota at the beginning of line 2—can *τ[ω]* be read?—and in line 5 either *Φαῶφι* *ξ* or *Φαῶφ(ι)* *ξ*, supposing the apparent iota to be a dark fibre, should be read (the line-numbering is incorrect). 21 gives the earliest date recorded in papyri (10 Feb. A.D. 285) for Diocletian's reign, and 23-24 additional confirmation of J. Lallemand's case for dating Domitius Domitianus' second year from 29 Aug. 295 instead of 296—but it is incorrect to say that there is 'a generally accepted identification' of Domitius with Achilles, who was, on the contrary (*teste* P. Mich. iii. 220, supported by P. Cair. Inv. 57095), the usurper's *ἐπανορθωτής* or *corrector*. 28 has been misunderstood: it is a contract of hire made by a sailor with the representatives of the villages concerned; the occurrence of a *πραιπόσιτος* *πλοίων* and of the word *καθολικότης* here is most interesting. 29 contains a notable conundrum in the word *προτέρτοι* and a highly colloquial sense of *στομόυν*. The feminine noun in 30. 6 is surely *ὑποδ[οχ]ής*; the *exactor* referred to is a local tax-collector and a subordinate of the *ὑποδέκτης*. 36 elicits a suggestion about Byzantine 'small change' which numismatists may care to pursue, and 39 is a museum-piece for connoisseurs of curious syntax and spelling. The interpretations offered of 40. 59 ff. are none of them satisfactory; *κοινῷ ὄντος πρὸς σε* must be taken together, and it will then be seen that the sentence is added in order to qualify *τοῦ μητρώου μου τρίτου μέρους* (l. 32) and to make it plain that the whole of this third share now belongs to Apollos. If there is any omission—which I doubt—it is of *τὸ ἐμὸν ἡμῶν*, or something similar, in l. 61. The only alternative is to assume that *τὸν νῦν ἡγορακότα* is an anacoluthon, that the writer meant to go on *τὸ ἐμὸν ἡμῶν ἡγοράκας* but slipped into the accusative case after writing *Ἀπολλῶν κτλ.* With regard to the absence of subscriptions in 41, Husselman has shown (P. Mich. Teb. ii, Introd.) that this procedure, though a reversal of the normal, is not unparalleled; contract and subscriptions were not necessarily written at the same time. Apollos may have acquired a copy, without subscriptions, of this document for reasons unknown to us, or, with 40 and 42, it may have remained in the notary's possession all the time. 43, like the rest of the Aphroditō papyri (40-60), is an invaluable document, with its confirmation of Bell's view that the beginning of the indiction varied from year to year and

was separately fixed for each province, its reopening of the question of the meaning of *συγκλισμός*, its mention of a 'Ptolemaid' nome (cf. 44), and its suggestion that an *ἀντιμίσθωσις* is a lease executed by the lessor and deliberately distinguished from one made by the lessee—L.S.J. clearly confuses it with *μεταμίσθωσις*.

There are two wooden tablets: the first illustrates the reversion to a Greek formula—the reading is beyond doubt—in the middle of a Latin certificate, apparently through ignorance of the Latin equivalent, the second, the mathematical tablet already published in detail in *Aegyptus* xxiii, gives arithmetical problems and division tables. The volume ends with sixty-two ostraca, all from a single site and pertaining to the administration of the same estate (c. A.D. 200). In five of them occurs the name of a month *Παγάξ*, possibly another form of *Παχών*; two introduce a lexicographical puzzle in the word *καθημενείτης*—is it somehow connected with *καθῆσθαι*?—and one, 125, a new instance of *σελίγνια* (*σιλίγνια*). P. Oxy. 2046 and an unpublished Merton papyrus confirm Crawford's view that these are 'loaves of fine wheat bread'; L. and S. is in any case wrong in rendering *siligo* 'winter wheat' and L.S.J. in identifying *σιλίγνιον* with it. *σιλίγνιον* is more likely to be a rendering of *siligineum* (for *siligineus panis*?), a suggestion for which I am indebted to Dr. L. A. Moritz, but the loaf is surely not as big as Crawford tried to make it; in P. Oxy. cit. the difference was one of quality, not of quantity.

P. Michael. is full of interesting material especially in relation to Byzantine Egypt and Aphrodito. It reflects great credit on Crawford that he was able to produce almost single-handed an edition so well balanced and often verging on the brilliant. Such minor features as seem to merit criticism spring no doubt from this very independence and from the extreme tenacity of purpose which occasionally drove him to seek a solution where none may now be hoped for. One wishes that he had not adopted so perverse a method of diplomatic transcription, and one is sometimes vexed by a suspicion that his readings are not altogether reliable. But, for all that, one is left with a great admiration for what he was able to achieve, and a great regret for what he was prevented from achieving. A burst of nationalistic violence has deprived Egypt of one of the most promising students of her antiquity.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth

B. R. REES

A GREEK ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY

HJALMAR FRISK: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Lieferung 1, pp. i-viii, 1-96; Lieferung 2, pp. 97-192; Lieferung 3, pp. 193-288. Heidelberg: Winter, 1954-5. Paper, DM. 8.60 each.

A FULL and up-to-date etymological dictionary of Greek has long been a pressing need. Professor Frisk has therefore no small expectation to satisfy, and deserves no little gratitude for his undertaking, of which the first three fascicules, reaching *γαμβρός*, permit an estimate of the scope and character. Among Latin etymological dictionaries it resembles Ernout and Meillet rather than Walde-Hofmann; it gives usually only the most probable conjectures, and refuses to be an 'indogermanisches Wörterbuch nach griechischen Stichwörtern

aufge-
Indo-
frequ-
are li-
access-

The
norm-
place
know-
only e-
might
under-
ing hi-
wörter,
numb-
but so-
άκνω-
ἀμφί-
decide-
eviden-
citation-
non-G-
stands
loan-w-

Fris-
etymol-
ἀρχα-
unprov-
'wahr-
corresp-
doubt-
(Scheid-
cleave,
not al-
überein-
fining
as 'Sch-
cealed
equatio-
is a bo-
partly
noting
range o-
nates. V
diction-
(s.v. 88

Ther-
Europe-
andh- : 2
*zendh-

aufgestellt' (p. iii). For those who enjoy speculations and excursions into other Indo-European languages Frisk gives ample references to other works, and frequent expressions such as 'Hypothesen bei Bq.', 'Weitere Lit. bei Bq.' are likely to ensure for Boisacq a permanent place next to Frisk on an accessible bookshelf.

The dictionary is clearly intended to account for every Greek word. Derivatives, normally ranged under their respective primitives, appear in their alphabetical place if they are likely to be difficult to trace for a reader with an elementary knowledge of Greek. Compounds are noticed, according to the Introduction, only exceptionally. This policy has not been followed with full consistency. It might require divination rather than elementary Greek to discover *βλίκανος* under *βάτραχος*; while this is an extreme case, others may cause at least a passing hindrance. Some compounds, despite obvious derivation, appear as *Stichwörter*, e.g. *ἀποχειροβόλος*, *αὐτοκράτωρ*. A few minutes' sampling will show a number of omissions. Most are obscure glosses (though many such are included), but some are more substantial, e.g. *ἀκάκης* (unless it is to figure under *κακός*), *ἄκινος* and *ἀκίνυος*, *ἐναλλάξ* (other similar compounds are given s.v. *ἀλλάσσω*), *ἀμφίβατος*, *ἀνάκτωρ* and its derivatives, *ἄρα*. It can have been no easy task to decide which to include of the foreign words attested in glosses, where no evidence indicates whether they were true loan-words or mere occasional citations in special contexts. Yet it seems pointless to include the confessedly non-Greek *αὐκήλως* 'ἔως ὑπὸ Τυρρηγῶν' Hesych. If *ἀ-* 'in kleinasiatischen Namen' stands as a head-word, why not also the movable *ἀ-* of some Mediterranean loan-words?

Frisk shows an admirable restraint and discrimination in the selection of etymologies, as in his comments on them. Even under so important a word as *ἄρχω* he quotes no conjectures, dismissing them as 'alle wertlos'. He regards as unproven the usual etymology of *ἄγιος*, *ἄγνός*; even *ἄρη* is stated only to be 'wahrscheinlich urverwandt' with a Balto-Slavic word with which it exactly corresponds in sounds and meaning. Yet he seems inclined to accept a few doubtful suggestions, such as Pisani's connexion of *ἄγρυμ* with L. *uagina* (*Scheide/scheiden* is a treacherous parallel, since 'to break, smash' is not 'to cleave, divide, separate'). His treatment of the semantic side of etymology is not always clear. *ἀλέγω* and *ἄλγος* must, he thinks, be connected 'wegen der übereinstimmenden Bedeutung'; but this agreement is achieved only by defining the former as '*eig.* "Schmerz, Leid über etwas empfinden"', the latter as 'Schmerz, Leid, *Kummer*' (our italics), definitions which, in however concealed a manner, beg the question. He rejects on semantic grounds the current equation of *ἀφρός* with Sk. *abhrá-* 'cloud', yet regards it as likely that L. *blaesus* is a borrowing of *βλαυσός* 'trotz der abweichenden Bedeutung'. He objects partly on semantic grounds to connecting *βόστρυχος* with certain words denoting 'tuft', 'brushwood', 'branch', 'wood', although the possibility of this range of meanings is illustrated by E. *lock* (of hair), *bush*, *brush*, and their cognates. While a sense of humour is not the prime requirement of an etymological dictionary, it is a little pompous, as well as linguistically unsound, to envisage (s.v. *βδελυρός*) 'ähnliche Silbendissimilation auch in *Βδελυ-κλέων*'.

There are indications of a reserved attitude to some recent trends in Indo-European phonology. Under *ἀθήρ* Frisk doubts an Indo-European alternation *andh-*: *ἡdh-*, though with laryngeal formulation nothing is more natural than **ḡndh-* > *ἀνθ-*, **ḡndh-* > *ἄθ-*. Prothetic vowels cause the usual difficulties.

Frisk refers to the literature in each case, as a rule expressing no opinion; in ἀνεμῖος he regards the ἀ- as 'gewiß prothetisch', rejecting without mention the usual derivation from *ση-νεptiyos.

It is good to see forms from Linear B texts beginning to take their place in this dictionary (s.vv. ἀναξ, ἄρτος, βασιλεύς, βουκόλος), disguised though they are with the strange label 'ägäisch'—a term used with quite inconsistent meaning s.v. ἀσκάλαβος, 'wahrscheinlich ägäisches LW'.

The following points are offered as comments, not as criticisms:

ἀδελφεός: a probable phase in the ousting of φράτηρ was φράτηρ ἀδελφεός (cf. (*frater*) *germanus* > *Sp. hermano*). αἰγίς: formal considerations apart, ἐν- and κατ-αίγίζω belong not here but under αἶξ; their metaphorical meaning must start from 'goat', not 'goatskin'. αἶφνης: since ἐξαίφνης is earlier and much commoner, whereas αἰφνίδιος is earlier and commoner than ἐξαφνίδιος, one may assume a substantive *αἶφνη < *αἶπ-σ-νᾱ; ἐξαίφνης then takes its place among adverbs derived from cases, such as ἐφεξῆς, ἐσάντα (cf. Schwyzler, i. 625). ἀμάομαι: it is strange that ἄμνη/ἄμη is cited only here, and without reference to, for example, Sk. *āmātram* 'vessel, pitcher'. Since a connexion of ἀμάομαι and ἄντλος is maintained, it would have been apposite to note that Nicander and Quintus Smyrnaeus use the latter to denote 'heap of corn'; this can hardly be an extension of the usual meaning, but accords excellently with ἀμάομαι 'sammeln, häufen', and is therefore perhaps ancient. ἀρήν: πολύρρην, dat. πολύρρην (*Il.* ii. 106), suggest, notwithstanding Armenian, an original declension *φρήν φαρνός* (< **urēn *wṛh-ós*) of good Indo-European type. ἄρτος: Frisk clearly inclines to Hubschmid's explanation of it as a substratum element on the strength of similar words in Basque and Old Spanish; but *artón* and corresponding forms, widespread in the slang of French, Spanish, and Portuguese, may, like other slang words for foodstuffs, come from Greek. ἄφενος: 'davon (mit Vokalsynkope . . .) ἀφνειός'; is vowel syncope known in Greek? βρακεῖν: βράψαι, βράπτειν are said to be perhaps influenced by μάρψαι, μάρπτειν; may they not as well be the same words (alternance *αρ/ρα* < *ρ*)? βροτός: the synonymous form *μορτός* is equated with Sk. *mārta-* (with *o*-grade); if so, the position of the accent is not original; if it is original, the two Greek words are identical (Achaean-Aeolic alternance *ορ/ρο* < *ρ*).

In a work so difficult for the proof-reader a few misprints and slips are to be expected. The following list does not claim completeness: ἀκριβής etc. (quantity of ι not marked); s.v. ἀλλᾶς, *ἀλλα-φευτ- for -φευτ-; s.v. ἀνεω, the same reference appears as Ψ 93 and ψ 93 (the latter is correct); s.v. ἄπας, εἰς for εἰς; s.v. ἄρπ, ἀρτέομαι for ἀρτέομαι; s.v. Ἀχαιοί, ἀχαΐζειν for -ειν; s.v. βραχὺς, 'langes Leben', 'langlebig' for 'kurzes Leben', 'kurzlebig'.

A few such criticisms are nothing to offset the great learning and sound judgement which Frisk has brought to his task. The remaining fascicules will be awaited with eagerness and with confidence. Meanwhile it is salutary to be reminded that in Greek, which has contributed so much to the theory of Indo-European, an astonishingly large proportion of the vocabulary, including common terms such as ἀήρ, ἄθλος, ἄρχω, still lacks convincing etymologies.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

PAON
ptor
Pape
FRAS
probl
the p
sugge
editio
norum
Fabul
by O.
All
Marce
et qu
Linds
his No
from
Festus
schola
large,
source
'Voss.
for Fes
quoted
book o
(20 F)
sugges
notes;
inquit
(cf. No
the for
p. 80 c
pity it
to thin
What
duty of
tive cri
coniect
of unne
focused
supplie
in -as, r
places.
modo:sti
(104 F)
50 (46 F
99 (95 F

FABULA ATELLANA

PAOLO FRASSINETTI: *Fabularum Atellanarum Fragmenta*. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. xxi+96. Turin: Paravia, 1955. Paper, L. 800.

FRASSINETTI's *Fabula Atellana* (1953) was mainly concerned with the larger problems of this obscure and interesting form of drama; though he then had the present work in hand, and there and elsewhere he has already published suggestions on the text and interpretation of particular fragments. This critical edition is designed to replace the relevant part of Ribbeck's *Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*³ (1898), the obsolete standard text, for which the *Atellana Fabula* of D. Romano (1953) provided no acceptable substitute (see the review by O. Skutsch, *Gnomon* 1954, 57 ff.).

All our texts are brief quotations—the overwhelming majority by Nonius Marcellus; and Lindsay's Nonius, which appeared in 1903, is 'fundamentum et quasi column huiusce editionis' (p. viii). Frassinetti adds a little to Lindsay's *app. crit.*, and not always wisely, from Onions's reports of readings (in his Nonius i-iii and in Ribbeck); outside Nonius, he has modernized Ribbeck from the present standard editions, for instance Lindsay's two editions of Festus and Barwick's of Charisius; and he has sifted the writings of modern scholars for new conjectures and interpretations; but the gain, as he says, is not large, and it is offset by his own abridgements and inaccuracies in reporting his sources. Pp. xvii-xx give some obvious examples: why, for instance, contract 'Voss. lat. fol. 73' to 'Voss. lat. 73' and '4^{to}. 116' to '4. 116'; why cite the *sigla* for Festus without F(!), or those for Priscian without ALK, which are all to be quoted later; why credit poor Passerat with a book of comedies instead of a book of conjectures? In the text (I choose examples from Pomponius): 21-22 R (20 F), the 'Mue.' (*bis*) is C. F. W. Müller, not L. Müller as the abbreviation suggests; 26¹ (25 F) and 87-89 (83-85 F) have apparently lost their critical notes; 67-68 (63 F), 'puella *scripti*' is untrue, as we learn from Ribbeck; 160, inquit *codd.*—hence the attempts by some editors to preserve it; 179-80 (cf. Novius 16 (17 F)), Lindsay's note has been woefully misunderstood, and in the former case misleadingly conflated with Ribbeck's. A palmary misprint on p. 80 credits Sulla with writing *σατυρικαὶ κωμωδίαὶ τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ*. What a pity it was not to persevere and get these things right: we have quite enough to think about in the fragments, without doing our editor's job for him.

What is the editor's job with these fragments, apart from the elementary duty of accuracy? Frassinetti ranges himself with Lindsay and other conservative critics against what he calls, with some justice, the *audacior immutandi coniectandique libido* of Ribbeck. The result is beneficial, at least in that a number of unnecessary alterations are expelled from the text; moreover, attention is focused on difficulties which it was easy to forget, and on some of these notes are supplied: e.g. the split anapaest *amicus amici*, Pomp. 145, and the nom. pl. fem. in -as, 141 (140 F), 151 (150 F): Ribbeck emended at the first and last of these places. Should we then not have had a brief remark on the preservation of *modo:stic* in 140 (137 F), and the introduction of *si stud.* after 'Lachm.', in 108 (104 F)? Or on dactylic word-endings as feet in trochaic septenarii, 27 (26 F), 50 (46 F), of which Lindsay preserves one and Ribbeck neither? On *nesciō quis*, 99 (95 F), *nesciōquid*, 120 (119 F)? Or on the scansion *paenulārium*, *cilotrū petit*

(iamb. sen.) which is postulated for Nov. 35? The reader who is less tolerant than Housman's agricultural labourer may agree that we should, even if he thinks these readings are right; failing that, some further remarks on metre are called for in the preface (where a word or two on hiatus would have been welcome in any case).

Frassinetti's more positive contributions to the text are mostly included in the lists on pp. ix f. (not without a false reference to (Nov.) '86 (88 R)'); and here are a few samples. Pomp. 61 (57 F): *oro te, base, per lactes tuas*—preferring *base* (= *φαλλέ*) to *basse*, *bas(s)o* and Ribbeck's *uas*, and explaining the line as an absurd address to the Lar Familiaris in phallic form: but might not *bas(s)e* equally well represent *bassus* 'fat', on the evidence quoted by the *Thesaurus* and Walde-Hofmann, s.v.? 71-72 (66-67 F): the transposition *cibaria/nam*... to make troch. sept. gives an awkward inversion. 111 (110 F): *Pappus hicin Mēsius habitat, senica non sescunciae?* introduces *Mēsius* from Varro *L.L.* vii. 96 for *medio* (*codd.*) and various earlier proposals, including Lindsay's *Maedio* and F.'s own *medix*. 140 (137 F): *particulones produc cantibus* is perhaps better than *producam tibi*, and certainly better than *produc: aut ibus* (*Fab. Atell.*, 109). Nov. 161 (18 F) and 60: it seems unnecessary to provide for two speakers (the change after *uxorem* in Pomp. 82-83 (78-79 F) is a device of Ribbeck's which spoils the point of *rhetorissas*—a pity to keep it). 52 (53 F): *uadimoniosum (uestimentum)* is adopted from one manuscript as a comic adjective. 109¹ (107 F): *fauces foui* (Ribbeck²) and not *gargarissau* (Ribbeck², Frass.) is surely the expression for which Fronto invokes the support of Novius and others. The brief exegetical notes are very much a step in the right direction, and it is sad that one or two of Ribbeck's are lost without trace. They range from useful references to more developed speculations, from which one may venture to differ (e.g. on Pomp. *Agamemno Suppositus* and inc. nom. vi (vii F)); some could have been better worded, for instance those on Pomp. 112 (111 F), and 150 (158 F).

It is an ungrateful and sometimes too easy occupation of reviewers to ask for more, but it does seem clear from the present work that another edition of *Atellana* fragments must at least be reasonably accurate in its facts (and this, admittedly, is sometimes a little difficult with the present printed sources); it should, somehow, find more space to mention difficulties to the reader, instead of tacitly inviting him to substitute one printed word for another; and it might, if it were to be very helpful, do something rational with the *testimonia*, instead of mentioning them at haphazard, if at all. It may not ever be very pleasurable to pore over these isolated scraps of Latin, but it might be made more instructive.

University College, London

E. W. HANDLEY

THE PROLOGUES OF PLAUTUS

KARLHANS ABEL: *Die Plautusprologe*. (Frankfurt diss.) Pp. 160. Mülheim (Ruhr): privately printed, 1955. Paper.

THE prologues of Plautus have interested many scholars in different aspects: How far are they authentic? What do they show of the poet, and his theatre? How close are they to the Greek? These questions are not fully separable, and Dr. Abel, who discusses the prologues individually, takes their problems as they arise. His concise text makes cross-reference easy; chapter-summaries give a

brief view of the prologue's nature and purpose, and there are tables of dates, interpolations, and Plautus' departures from his models. The skeletal exposition needs its notes, and the notes a library; for though bibliography is copious and usually well deployed, one misses quotations, and sometimes citable sources, or comment: e.g. for the date and festival of *Pseud.* it would be kind to mention the didascalía as well as Ritschl and Schutter; Fraenkel, *Phil.* lxxxvii. 117 ff. appropriately heads thirteen references for the equation *Cist.*—*Symaristosai*, but we are not told that he first proved it or from what. Otherwise plan and organization are admirable.

On authenticity, Dr. Abel is conservative, regarding as post-Plautine only *Cas.* 5–22 (he adds 21 f. to the recognized interpolation, on two weak arguments), *Cist.* 125 and 130–2 (added for performance, to eliminate the Auxilium-prologue, as Leo and others suggested), and *Poen.* 124–6 (the minimal excision in a difficult passage). The two-line prologue of *Pseud.* is valiantly defended as authentic and complete; the possible loss of whole prologues is not discussed.

There is some good criticism of Plautus' appeals to his public; the prologues show him above all as an *amuseur* (Michaut): e.g. in *As. prol.*, Greek author and title are a guarantee of genuine Greek goods, not mere information; the joke at the herald (5), and the mock deference ('he wants it to be *Asinaria*, if you agree') go with the play on the poet's name to create enjoyment and enlist goodwill; the appeal to *lepos ludusque* is characteristic of Plautus' attitude to comedy. So *Truc. prol.* is seen as a Plautine creation, not to expound the plot, but to advertise it, like a film trailer; but in this light the appeal for a hearing for *Captivi* in 53 ff. remains 'a long unsolved conundrum' (p. 52).

Dr. Abel may go too far in stressing this side of Plautus against the serious side of his originals: it is difficult, for instance, to see a *pièce à thèse* in Philemon's *Emporos*, and *Most.* 1149 ff. may reflect a genuine impression of his and Diphilus' comedy as opposed to the Menander of *Perikeiromene* or *Adelphoi B.* Many interesting things are said about the plays and their originals that cannot be noticed here. So far as prologues go, Plautus seems to get too much credit: I see nothing in the Latin of *Trin.* to prove that *Luxuria* and *Inopia* are Plautine creations (certainly not *nomen indidit*, etc. 8 f.), and no good reason to deny to the Greek poet the simple device of displaying the two prisoners for *Capt.* Greek comic prologues, argues Dr. Abel, were never simply *prologi*, but always in character—human, divine, or personified like *Agnoia*. Surviving fragments do not prove him wrong, but he should at least not deny *πρόλογος* 'prologue-figure' in Lucian, *Pseudol.* 4: cf. 5 ὁ πρόλογος ἤδη φησὶ ταῦτα.

There is space to mention a few other points of disagreement. The tentative dating of *Most.* to 204 looks most unsafe (p. 19); 193 is now suggested by Schutter, in Enk's *Festschrift, Vt pictura poesis* (1955) 174 ff. The *strengte Auslegung* of Cic. *Brutus* 60 (p. 83), which makes Naevius die in or after 184 and unfixes the date of *Miles*, seems *inter alia* to destroy Cicero's point; *Poen.* 23 ff. is also pointless, I think, if slaves were effectively prevented from watching plays (p. 90); *Poen.* 123 proves that the *prologus* was not dressed as an actor, but not that he wore his ordinary working clothes, unlike Terence's *Ambivivus Turpio* (p. 91). But much is uncertain in this whole subject, and it is good to have it dealt with by a scholar who has spared no pains in marshalling his own and his predecessors' arguments with clarity and force.

SALLUST'S *JUGURTHA*

KARL VRETSKA: *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*. (Sitz. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl., Bd. 229, 4 Abh.) Pp. 169. Vienna: Rohrer, 1955. Paper, S. 50.40.

VRETSKA's study appears hard on the heels of Büchner's *Der Aufbau von Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*, to which the author has been able to refer only in a brief Introduction and in a number of footnotes. The new work, while it seems to follow the main lines of recent continental thought on Sallust, is sufficiently individualistic in its approach to demand attention. At the outset Vretska rejects Büchner's distinction between the anatomy of Sallust's work (dictated by the main events of the war) and the themes which colour successive sections of it (viz. *Jugurtha*, *respublica*, *virtus* of the field commanders) and which are differing facets of the role of *virtus* in history. He does so for two reasons, first because the excursus is unable to do its dividing work at both these levels, and second because he believes that for Sallust *virtus* always has an ethical content which would make it impossible for him to think in terms of the *virtus* of Jugurtha, as Büchner does. Moreover, he believes that the emphasis on *virtus* gives undue prominence to the individuals who display it and leads to an attempt to assess Sallust's work as a piece of biographical history, which it is not.

For Vretska the subject of the monograph is, in Sallust's words, *bellum quod populus Romanus cum Jugurtha . . . gessit*. From this we must assume, if Sallust is to be treated as a conscious artist, that the sections of the work reflect the progress of the war, and Vretska divides accordingly:

1. (a) Historical introduction and beginning of the war: 5. 4-16.
- (b) First campaigns: 20-40.
2. Rome at war with Jugurtha alone: 43-76.
3. Rome at war with Jugurtha and Bocchus: 80-113.

In the first section Sallust transforms the disconnected historical facts about Jugurtha into a unity, by seizing on a common human characteristic as a basic motive, the lust for power. This, as exemplified by Jugurtha, he confronts with another characteristic, the lust for wealth which characterized ruling circles in Rome. He thus raises history from a mere narration of single events and fortuitous occurrences to a close sequence of remorseless consequences springing from the character of the protagonists. (This emphasis on the formative influence of character occurs again and again, e.g. the note of doom in Adherbal's forlorn plea to the Senate; his fate was written in his character, *quietus, imbellis, placido ingenio*.) The excursus on Africa which subdivides this section marks a switch of emphasis away from Jugurtha, who has naturally predominated in the *Vorgeschichte*, and on to the *avaritia* at Rome, which now comes into the open, thwarting and nullifying the early military efforts of the Romans, and overshadowing in Sallust's account the events of the first campaigns. The first main break in the work is marked by the excursus on party politics (41-42), which closes the section on party strife culminating in the *quaestiones*, and opens the way for the single-hearted prosecution of the war. The final excursus, on Leptis, heralds a new factor in the struggle, the intervention of Bocchus. Vretska points out that this interpretation of the main themes has the merit of giving a purpose to the excursus on Leptis which is conspicuously lacking in Büchner's division.

The second section of Vretska's study contains chapters on Memmius,

Metellus, Marius, and Sulla, in which he elaborates his views on the purpose of their characterization; a chapter on the battle descriptions; and a chapter on 'Pathos, Peripetie und Spannung', in which he is at some pains to distinguish the dramatic qualities inherent in a work based on character from the dramatic devices of Hellenistic historiography.

The principal value of this study lies in its careful and detailed examination of Sallust's words and the way in which the detail is shaped to contribute to the total effect. But two criticisms will occur to the reader. The first is that the search for an artistic pattern is carried to inordinate lengths. One may well ask oneself whether some of the elaborate contrapuntal arrangements discovered by Vretska were ever intended by Sallust, or whether his audience was even subconsciously aware of them. The second criticism is more serious: the pattern once laid down, every detail must be made to fit, and it is small wonder if Vretska's methods appear quite procrustean from time to time. The most unpromising phrases are discovered to be fraught with meaning, every flinty infinitive is squeezed for its drop of blood, and there is a companion tendency to neglect what does not suit the pattern. For instance (p. 62) the phrase *Zamam statuit oppugnare* (56. 1) is interpreted as implying a deliberate limitation of objective on the part of Metellus: 'er will nicht die Eroberung der Stadt'. Even if one ignores the blood and sweat expended by the forces of Metellus in a fruitless siege, and Sallust's plain statement (61. 1) that Metellus desisted *postquam videt frustra inceptum, neque oppidum capi neque Jugurtham pugnam facere*, would Vretska really have us believe that *oppugnare* means 'to attack a town, not meaning to capture it'? Or that if Metellus had intended to capture Zama, Sallust would have written *expugnare*? The purpose of these verbal contortions is, of course, to maintain his thesis that the military initiative now lies exclusively with the Romans, and it is to the same end that the two damaging attacks on Marius (97, 101) are dismissed so casually (p. 61).

Similarly (p. 50) in the phrase *contionibus populum vindicandum hortari* (30. 3) Vretska finds the use of *populus* instead of *plebs* significant of a desire to demonstrate that Memmius was no mere party politician. A tenuous argument at the best; but surely *populus* is the inevitable word here, with *contionibus*? Just as *plebs* is the inevitable word in a phrase a few lines below, *plebis animum incendebat*, a phrase which Vretska does not consent to notice in a context from which he has so successfully banished one reference to party strife. The dangers of this verbal jugglery are shown again in the chapter on Memmius (pp. 85-86), where the doubtful distinction is drawn between the phrases *infestus potentiae nobilitatis* and *infestus nobilitati* (applied to Memmius and Marius respectively) to which is made to correspond a further distinction between *pauci potentes* and *nobiles*. But can the *pauci potentes* in 31. 9-10 be anything but the Senate dominated by the *nobiles*? Vretska tacitly admits this when he contrasts (p. 90) Memmius' description of Rome's rulers (31. 11) with Adherbal's idealized picture of the Senate.

In a detailed work such as this, specific blemishes perhaps loom larger than they should, and it would be a mistake to let them overshadow the many excellent things in Vretska's work; for he has much to say that is illuminating or provocative of thought.

Only a few misprints have been noticed: p. 31, *venalem* for *venalia*; p. 47, *Päsens* for *Präsens*.

University of Birmingham

D. A. MALCOLM

ROMAN REPUBLICAN ORATORY

Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae iteratis curis recognovit, collegit ENRICA MALCOVATI. Pp. xx+564. Turin: Paravia, 1955. Paper, L. 2,500.

EIGHTY-EIGHT years elapsed between the second edition of H. Meyer's *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta* (Zürich, 1842) and the first edition of Signorina Malcovati's work of the same title (3 vols., Turin, 1930). After only twenty-five years Malcovati now publishes a second edition, which is in fact a completely new corpus of the remains of Roman republican oratory.

Good as the first edition was, the second marks a great improvement upon it. Its scope has been widened, so that 176 orators are now included, as against 108. Most of the new-comers are small fry. But some, like Q. Lutatius Catulus Iunior, with fragments from five speeches (pp. 333-7), P. Clodius Pulcher, with fragments from seven speeches (pp. 427-30), C. Vibius Pansa, with fragments from five speeches (pp. 476-9), are remarkably big to have slipped through the net of earlier collectors. As well as new orators, we have new fragments of old ones. L. Marcius Philippus now has eleven fragments from six speeches instead of six fragments from four; Cn. Pompeius Magnus has nineteen fragments from thirteen speeches instead of twelve from eight; L. Sergius Catilina has eight fragments from five speeches instead of two from one; M. Porcius Cato Minor has twenty fragments from thirteen speeches instead of five from two, and so on. Of course, these figures are a little misleading. It is hard to distinguish between a *testimonium*, which merely tells us that a speech was made on a certain occasion, and a fragment, which, even if it is not a verbatim citation, tells us something about the content of the speech. And it is still harder to distinguish between a speech and a mere *obiter dictum* or contribution to an informal discussion. If Signorina Malcovati has erred, it is on the side of inclusiveness. The brief mentions in the *Brutus*, which are the only monuments we possess of the eloquence of T. Albucius (pp. 220-1), C. Visellius Varro (pp. 438-9), and C. Sicinius (p. 438) scarcely qualify to appear among the fragments of Roman oratory. And not all the odd words quoted by grammarians from C. Asinius Pollio (p. 526) necessarily came from his speeches. However, the editor is fully aware of what she is doing, and she is right, in a work of this kind, to give her orators the benefit of the doubt every time.

There is qualitative as well as quantitative improvement upon the first edition. Since 1930 there have appeared Lindsay's second edition of Festus (Paris, 1930), Reis's Teubner *Brutus* (Leipzig, 1934), the second volume of Radermacher's Teubner Quintilian (Leipzig, 1935), the last volumes of Lindskog and Ziegler's Teubner Plutarch's *Lives* (Leipzig, 1932-9), and van den Hout's (he appears on p. xv as van den Out) Fronto (Leiden, 1954), to name only some of the sources. Comparison of the fragments depending upon them in the two editions shows how much the editor has profited from these new texts. But she does not follow them blindly: e.g. in M. Porcius Cato frg. 128 = Fest. p. 350. 26 she continues to read *abstinui*, though Lindsay² conjectured *obstinavi*. Her own conjectures are few and trivial: e.g. in M. Porcius Cato frg. 167 = Gell. vi. 3. 37 and frg. 222 = Gell. x. 23. 5 she reads *impoene* for *impune*, citing in support Till, *Die Sprache Catos*, p. 2.

Many of the fragments are brought into much sharper historical focus than

in the first edition, and there is a new dating or a new attribution on almost every page. For instance the fragments of Cato the Censor are completely rearranged in the light of the work of Jantzer (*Historische Untersuchungen zu den Redefragmenten des M. Porcius Cato*, Würzburg, 1937), Scullard (*Roman Politics 220-150 B.C.*, Oxford, 1951), and Kienast (*Cato der Zensor*, Heidelberg, 1954). So much so that a concordance of the numeration in both editions occupies pp. 541-2. In every case the authority is quoted for the date adopted.

The prolegomena are entirely rewritten, in briefer form than before. For each orator we are given a biography and *cursus honorum* (in which much is owed to T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, New York, 1951-2), followed by references to the latest literature.

The layout has been improved, thanks in part to the larger page. The prolegomena, in italics, now precede the fragments of each orator. They are followed by *testimonia*, in small roman type. There are two apparatuses beneath the text, the first containing prolegomena to individual speeches, in italics, and *testimonia*, in small roman, the second consisting of critical notes. Running headlines help quick consultation. There is an alphabetical *Index oratorum* as well as a *Conspectus operis*.

There are few misprints, and the demon who waits upon those who copy other people's critical apparatus has had little success with Signorina Malcovati. On p. 490, last line, however, for 'etiam *Austini*' we should read 'etiam *Clark*', since Austin, who reprinted Clark's text and apparatus, expressly rejects the reading *etiam* in the second edition of his commentary on the *Pro Caelio* (pp. 82-83).

The labour which must have gone into this book is hard to imagine. But it is justified by the result. Malcovati² will long be a standard work; though not so long, one hopes, as Meyer².

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

CICERO'S LETTERS

- (i) M. Tulli Ciceronis *Epistularum ad Quintum Fratrem libri tres*, Quinti Ciceronis *Commentariolum Petitionis*. Recensuit HUBERTUS MORICCA; post eius obitum editionem curavit A. Moricca Caputo. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. xxxv+132. Turin: Paravia, 1955. Paper, L. 800.
- (ii) M. Tulli Ciceronis *Epistularum ad M. Brutum liber nonus*; Pseudo-Ciceronis *Epistula ad Octavianum*; *Fragmenta Epistularum*. Recognovit HUBERTUS MORICCA; post eius obitum editionem curavit A. Moricca Caputo. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pp. xxxiv+99. Turin: Paravia, 1955. Paper, L. 700.

THESE two volumes complete Moricca's edition of Cicero's Letters. Like the previous volumes (*Ad Fam.* 1950, reviewed *C.R.*, n.s. i. 186; *Ad Att.* 1953), they have been seen through the press by his widow.

Each of the two begins with an account of the manuscripts of the *Ad Q. F.* and the *Ad Brutum*; this account is essentially a reprint of that in vol. i of the *Ad Att.* edition, and the only point of interest in it is that Moricca follows Constans (as against Sjögren) in making Π (= GHN) a class co-ordinate with Σ (= EOVRP) instead of a subdivision of Σ (although once or twice in the

apparatus he forgets about this and uses Σ to include *II*). This is followed, in (i), by a short section on the manuscripts of the *Comm. Pet.* (the question of the authorship of this is reserved for a brief, mainly bibliographical, note preceding the text itself, which does not mention Mrs. Henderson's important article in *J.R.S.* xl [1950], 8 ff.), and by a list of the 'principal' editions (which, while including some of no importance whatever, omits Victorius's 1571 edition, and, in addition to other serious errors, represents Fr. Junius's notes as having been published in 1549, when he was in fact about four years old); similarly (ii) contains a few additional paragraphs on the authenticity of the *Ad Brut.* and on the *Ad Octav.* The other introductory matter in each consists of a collection of the few testimonia, a short bibliography (intended to supplement those in the previous volumes), and a chronological table to which each letter in the text is keyed.

(i) The text of the *Ad Q.F.* and the *Comm.* agrees in the main (except for a few misprints) with that of Constans, but in about thirty passages Moricca reverts to the reading of Sjögren's *editio minor* (Teubner, 1914). In most of these passages this means a reversion to the reading of the manuscripts, e.g. *Q.F.* i. 2. 3 *veritati* (*sever-* Const., rightly); i. 3. 2 *iracundiae* [sic] *causam* (*iracundiam causam* Const.); iii. 2. 3 *recte*, *et ipsa* (*recte est; ipsa* Const.); iii. 5. 4 *debet* (*debebat* Const.); only rarely does it mean a departure from the manuscripts, e.g. i. 3. 3 *imaginem tuam* (*im- meam* Const., with misplaced conservatism). In difficult passages, rather than obelize (his text of this volume contains only one obelus), he follows Constans in impossible or improbable restorations, e.g. ii. 3. 5 *C. Cornelium Stellatina, et eodem die*; ii. 9(8). 3 *sed ab acra Axyra*; ii. 15(14). 2 *ne laboro quadam mea*; iii. 5. 4 *an ποῦς vero*; iii. 7(9). 9 *mater ab Arcano non*. In other passages too he wrongly (in my opinion) follows Const.'s idiosyncracies, e.g. ii. 11(10). 5 *Appiae in vadis*; ii. 12(11). 2 *gravis noster Lamia*; iii. 15(14). 3 *aestumo mea*; iii. 2. 2 *summam in frequentiam*. The following are the only places in which he differs from both Constans and Sjögren: i. 1. 16 *amicitiaeque* *usu* (an unpublished suggestion of Castiglioni); i. 1. 22 *quare cum permagni* retained; ii. 14(13). 1 *Blandennone* retained; iii. 1. 3 *et silva vindicata* retained; iii. 1. 4 *Varro viam* (after Wesenberg); iii. 5. 7 *Troadam*; iii. 7(9). 7 *si tamen tam bonum* (a slight variation, which is the reverse of an improvement, on Const.); *Comm.* 18 *ex illa summa* retained.

The apparatus is likewise based largely on that of Constans, with some admixture of manuscript detail from Sjögren and of conjectures from Müller and the Oxford text. It is not only a mere compilation, but an untidy and unsystematic compilation; and it is not free from errors (like the attribution of readings to a manuscript in passages which it omits, or of critical notes to the wrong word). For the reader who is unfamiliar with the sources from which it has been compiled it will frequently be misleading; for others its only use will be that it reports two new suggestions of Castiglioni (at i. 1. 30 and 46).

(ii) The text of the *Ad Brutum* is practically a reprint (with minor changes of spelling and punctuation, and with half a dozen misprints) of Sjögren's *ed. minor*. In five passages only have I noticed divergencies: i. 7. 1 *potes quam Bibulum* (*-lus* Sj.; Mor. returns to the vulgate); i. 16. 2 *a quo[que] petendum* (this deletion of *que*, which is attractive, is really due to Fr. Junius, although from Mor.'s note one would infer that it is an unpublished suggestion of Castiglioni);

i. 17. 2 *hortatio ne eius pudeat* (Sj. does not insert *eius*, which is due to Madvig and not, as Mor.'s critical note suggests, read by the manuscripts); ib. 5 *patriae, quae de dignitate* (Sj. does not insert *quae*; Mor.'s note here is quite confused and wrong); ii. 1. 3 *in aciem esse* (*acie* Sj.; an example of misplaced conservatism on the part of Mor., whose critical principle is well stated in his note on p. 41, l. 33: 'qua re viri docti tradita quae ferri possunt mutare conentur, haud equidem video').

The apparatus presents some manuscript evidence additional to that given by Sjögren in his *ed. maior* (Gothenburg, 1910): (i) in a few places Moricca corrects minutiae in Sjögren's reports of M (Mediceus 49. 18); (ii) he gives the readings of O (Taurinensis Lat. 495) much more frequently than Sjögren, who examined it only in selected passages; (iii) he publishes, for the first time (so far as these letters are concerned), a collation of R (Parisinus 8538), which Sjögren neglected in favour of its close relation P (Parisinus 8536); this collation is inaccurate or misleading in more than a dozen passages (in particular, in five places the manuscript is stated to read a word which has quite clearly been deleted by the original scribe) and, because it is haphazard in its citation of *quisquiliae*, it is liable to lead the reader to believe that it is much fuller than in fact it is. This new evidence amounts to very little: at no point does it change the picture presented by Sjögren or have any effect on the text itself. For the rest, the apparatus is an uncritical and unmethodical compilation from Sjögren, Müller, the Oxford text, and Tyrrell-Purser's vol. vi (of which the out-of-date first edition has been used); it is liable to mislead not only by its frequent blunders and misprints but also by its sheer gaucherie of presentation. The only novelty it contains is an unpublished suggestion of Castiglioni at i. 2a. 2, viz. *eguisse* for *egisse*: ingenious, but not (I think) the right solution of this difficult passage.

The spurious *ad Octav.* enjoys the unmerited distinction of being preserved not only in most of the *Ad Att.* manuscripts but also in some of the *Ad Fam.* ones; in the latter tradition the oldest manuscripts which contain it are H (Harleianus 2682) and F (Berolinensis 252). Moricca publishes, for the first time, collations of V (Parisinus 14761) and D (Palatinus 598), which belong to the same class as HF. Here again the result is liable to mislead: (i) because of the double tradition, each with a manuscript denoted by H and one denoted by V, we occasionally find each of these symbols being used for two different manuscripts; (ii) more important, since Moricca did not collate H and F, and since his knowledge of their readings was limited to those reported by Sjögren, he was unaware that they consistently agree with VD in places where his apparatus (*ex silentio*) suggests that they agree with Ω (the *Ad Att.* tradition).

Moricca's presentation of the fragments is practically a reprint of Sjögren's, but here again there are frequent misprints and mistakes.

University of Aberdeen

W. S. WATT

THE BUDÉ PLINY

Pline l'Ancien: *Histoire naturelle*, livre ix. Texte établi, traduit et commenté par E. DE SAINT-DENIS. (Collection des Universités de France.) Pp. 157. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper, 750 fr.

PROFESSOR DE SAINT-DENIS, whose book, *Le Vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique*, was reviewed in *C.R.* lxxiii (1949), has produced an excellent

edition. His introduction is both scholarly and good-humoured. After illustrating Pliny's use of his main source, Aristotle, he has a sympathetic word for Pliny's fisherman's stories and asks us not to be too hasty in condemning him.

In establishing the text, the editor has studied a wide range of manuscripts, including *I*, *x*, *n*, and *V*, in which he has frequently found agreement with the corrections *D*², *F*², *R*², and *E*², and confirmation of many of Mayhoff's emendations. He has not, however, incorporated any of Mayhoff's proposals for dealing with lacunae, although all are noted. On occasion, his caution in this respect seems excessive, as in the case of *infittas* (79). There is also too much respect for the manuscripts in 5 (*non ictu, sed fragore*) and in 153 (*rapuit*). It is unfortunate that in 178 Rackham's emendation *mirabilibus* for *mirabilis* was not known. On the other hand, in 13 *toto* is rightly preferred to Mayhoff's *tuto*: the phrasing and word-order are poetical, recalling, for example, *Aeneid* xi. 406, *totis descendere campis*. De Saint-Denis claims only one original reading, *squali* for *squali* in 162.

There is an unsolved difficulty at the beginning of 29, *est provinciae Narbonensis et in Nemausiensi agro stagnum*, where Pliny cannot have meant to suggest that the territory was not part of the province (for this point see iii. 37, and for Pliny's usual phrasing cf. ii. 231, in *Carrinensi Hispaniae agro*, and ix. 75). Translators seem to ignore *et*. Perhaps *est* should be altered to *esse* and taken with *peruectum* at the end of 28, where it is needed to distinguish *peruectum* (perfect infinitive) from *eblanditum* and *exceptum* (participles). This allows us to change *et* to *est*.

The translation is clear and elegant, and has few faults: 16 *nimbos* is not 'des trombes d'eau': intentionally or not, Pliny is here more accurate about the spouting of whales than in 8 (*diluuiem quandam eructans*), where the editor might have added a comment on the matter; 38 in *operibus*: 'in treatises' (not 'dans l'industrie'); 39 the text means 'a fertile and shrewd talent', not 'la prodigalité et l'ingéniosité'; 61 'dans le "garum des alliés"' is at least a misleading rendering of *in sociorum garo*: the *socii* are the Associated Garum Manufacturers of Cartagena, as is mentioned by Professor P. Grimal in his paper on *garum*, a paper which deserves far more than the bare citation that it receives in the notes; 77 not 'un autre genre de supplice' but 'another kind of animal'; 172 Antonia was the wife of Drusus, not his daughter.

The commentary is admirable so far as it goes, but seems to have been limited by a shortage of space. We are constantly referred to the editor's 'Vocabulaire' and to D'Arcy Thompson's Glossary. But even with aids such as these, important points are left unexplained. For example, in 3 the horses' heads emerging from cockle-shells are taken both by de Saint-Denis and by Thompson (p. 129) to refer to sea-horses; but elsewhere (p. 93) Thompson suggests snails, and these seem to suit the text much better: surely Pliny is thinking of whelks. In 20 it might have been worth noting that, although dolphins can travel fast (at about 25 m.p.h.), many birds can keep up higher speeds. The question whether the cannibals of 77 were morays or lampreys still needs discussing: Thompson (pp. 164-5) is curt. A note is required on *lapis specularis* (113), which according to C. E. N. Bromehead (*Mineralogical Magazine*, xxvi [1943], 325-33) is translucent gypsum rather than mica. It should have been mentioned (on 116) that British pearls come from freshwater mussels and (on 121) that no vinegar could have dissolved Cleopatra's pearl: she must have swallowed it, either whole or as powder. On 129-41, references to Bailey's commentary on purple dyestuffs (vol. i, pp. 152-8) would have been helpful.

The editor is naturally more at home in his chosen field than in the allied subjects just mentioned. Here he has ably summed up most of the problems of identification and has thrown new light on some of them, for instance on those to do with *aries*, *lolligo*, *anthias* (*acanthias*). Above all, we can be truly grateful to him for stimulating our curiosity instead of killing it. For, in his own words, 'les richesses et les merveilles de la mer n'ont pas fini de nous étonner'.

There are two misprints in the Latin text, in 93 (superfluous hyphen) and in 170 (*Lucinius*).

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

CHRISTIAN LATIN LITERATURE

A. G. AMATUCCI: *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*. Seconda edizione interamente rifatta. Pp. viii+336. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1955. Paper, L. 1,200.

SIGNOR AMATUCCI, who is known for his *Storia della letteratura romana*, here presents a second and revised edition of his history of Christian Latin literature, by which he means the history of what might be called Christian Latin literature *par excellence*, that is to say, from the beginnings in the third century to the time of Gregory the Great, when the shadow of Medievalism had begun to fall over western Europe. So he begins with Minucius Felix and the other African writers, including, of course, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius, as well as the mysterious Commodian. A separate chapter is given to the lesser writers of the third century, such as Novatian, Victorinus, and, in a digression, Hippolytus. The scene now shifts to Spain and Gaul and to the beginnings of Christian Latin poetry, with Juvenius and Hilary, and then to Firmicus Maternus (a Syracusan), Lucifer of Cagliari (a Sardinian), Proba with her Virgilian *cento*, and Marius Victorinus. These are the writers of Signor Amatucci's first period. The second period is that of Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Prudentius. In it are included Damasus, Ausonius, Paulinus of Nola, the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Rufinus, Sulpicius Severus, Orosius, and Cassian. The third period stretches from the first half of the fifth century to the first half of the seventh, and is a period of what may be called full production, especially in Gaul, Spain, and Italy. The African writers are also dealt with and we reach the end of African Christianity with the Arab invasion. Room is found for Gildas in Britain, who shares a chapter with a strange companion, Jordanes the Goth.

Such is the scope of Signor Amatucci's book. He has clearly studied his authors with care and is widely read in current literature, though there are gaps in his bibliographical notes. The book is written with an abundance of enthusiasm which makes for many subjective judgements. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the author writes with a *parti pris*. He can hardly disguise his desire to minimize the oriental and Greek elements in the early Church in the West and to glorify the Latin. But the Church of Rome was more thoroughly Greek than Latin in the second and third centuries, and Hippolytus, who is accused of trying to give a new life to Greek Christian Literature, when he ought to have known that a Minucius Felix and a Tertullian had made this impossible, was writing in Greek merely because Greek was his own language and that of the Roman Church and his audience was better

acquainted with it than with Latin. Greek was still the language of the liturgy, and recent research suggests that it was not until late in the fourth century that Latin replaced it. The time of the great Greek fathers was yet to come. It was from them, as Signor Amatucci admits, that Ambrose learned his theology and his method of expounding Scripture. Nothing, surely, is to be gained by an attempt to deny the preponderance of the Greek element in the Church or to contest the Greek superiority in organization, in theology, and in literature, including music and hymnody. Such is his patriotic enthusiasm for the Latin and the 'Roman' that Signor Amatucci is led to claim for Lactantius, on the strength of his lively tract *De mortibus persecutorum*, a place beside Eusebius (whose invaluable history he describes as barren, dry, and cold) as the father of Christian historiography.

The reason why Christian Latin literature was so slow in appearing in Italy was that there was no demand for it. Rome was overrun by oriental Greeks from whom the Christian congregation was mostly drawn. Signor Amatucci does not like to think that the first Latin versions of the Scriptures came from Africa, and he is driven to much special pleading in his attempt to prove the contrary.

We can whole-heartedly admire the genius of a Tertullian and acknowledge the liveliness and freshness of Minucius Felix without feeling it necessary to speak of Greek Christian literature as moving steadily towards a frozen Byzantinism from which there was no issue.

Yet, with all these reservations, it is only right to add that this is an attractive and sympathetically written book. The chapter on Commodian is especially good. After all the controversy about his country and his date, it is refreshing to find Signor Amatucci deciding that he was probably an African and lived in the late third or early fourth century. For his poetry breathes the spirit of the African Christianity of the Cyprianic or post-Cyprianic age when martyrdom was still a possibility to be reckoned with.

On a larger scale, but with interesting and highly personal judgements, are Signor Amatucci's characterizations of Jerome and Augustine. Here, as with Prudentius and other writers, his concern is to find the Latin, that is, the 'Roman', element, and if this pre-occupation detracts from the objectivity of his work, it gives it a flavour of originality which is at once stimulating and challenging.

Jesus College, Cambridge

F. J. E. RABY

FACILIS MENDOSITAS

SVEN LUNDSTRÖM: *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Latinität*. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1, Bd. 51, Nr. 3.), Pp. 312. Lund: Gleerup, 1955. Paper, Kr. 30.

SOME indication of the range of this work may be gathered from the fact that the Stellenindex (pp. 300-12) contains 952 entries, approximately 72 per cent. of which are from four works: the *Historia Tripartita* of Epiphanius (cf. also Lundström's 'Sprachliche Bemerkungen' in *A.L.M.A.* xxiii, 1953); Josephus Latinus, *Contra Apionem*; Irenaeus Latinus, *Adversus haereses* (cf. Lundström's *Studien zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung*, Diss. Lund, 1943; *Neue Studien z. lat.*

Iren., Lund, 1948); and the *Itala*—works which especially meet the requirements of an investigator of this problem, who must in the first place concern himself with verbal or near-verbal translations whose originals are extant. Only when this step has been accomplished can he turn—with caution—to those whose originals are lost: often it is only comparison with the original that reveals an error in a Latin text (cf. Introduction, pp. 12–13).

This book does not claim to embrace the whole field of Übersetzungstechnik: characterized by Lundström himself as 'nur eine Art Prinzipienlehre' (p. 12), it classifies, illustrates, and discusses types of translation-error and handles problems developing from them, treating primarily grosser errors, more trivial ones only when analogous to more difficult examples discussed. There is, for example, only incidental mention of 'Doppelübersetzungen', and Lundström merely touches upon the difficult problem of 'auditory' errors due to (possible) dictation of the Greek text to the translator, or of the translation to a copyist.

In Part I (Lexikalischer Teil, pp. 17–198) sections 1–7 of Chapter I deal with what may be called 'unconscious' errors whose source is in the sphere of palaeography—error of vowel, pp. 19–27; of consonant, pp. 27–30; through abbreviations, pp. 30–37; through incorrect word-division, pp. 37–41; through loss (pp. 41–47) or addition (pp. 47–52) of letter(s); and complicated errors (pp. 52–63). Other 'unconscious' errors treated are Lesezeichenfehler (Ch. i, section 9, pp. 70–73—not certainly, it seems, palaeographical errors) and those arising out of homonymy (Ch. ii, pp. 74–77). Other mistakes come about when the translator, confronted by an unfamiliar word, or a familiar word apparently repugnant to the context, has recourse to conjectural emendation (cf. Ch. i, section 8, pp. 63–70—the corrector may be other than the translator), to substitution (Ch. iii, pp. 78–83), to interpretation by way of (false) etymology (Ch. iv, pp. 84–97), to arbitrary translation (Ch. v, pp. 98–100), or to omission (Ch. vi, pp. 101–3).

Chapter vii (pp. 104–98) deals with problems in which a sense, possible but contextually inappropriate, is attributed to a word through a fault of memory, perhaps, in the absence of dictionaries rather than of judgement. The error may affect a single word only—cf. especially section 2 (Substantives and Adjectives) *a*, pp. 105–31; section 4 (Verbs) *a*, pp. 139–47—or attribution of an incorrect sense may be linked with syntactical error or arbitrary interpretation of the whole passage—cf. especially section 2 *b*, pp. 131–3; section 4 *b* (with additional—palaeographical—complication), pp. 147–61. Sometimes *a* (partial) Graecism may involve extension of meaning of a Latin word—cf. especially section 2 *c* (including later, purely Latin, development), pp. 133–36; section 4 *c*, pp. 161–66. The remaining sections are not subdivided: 3 treats Pronouns (pp. 137–8), 5 Adverbs and Negation (pp. 166–8), 6 Conjunctions (pp. 168–71), and 7 Prepositions (pp. 171–98).

It will be clear that because of this wide range of types of error (to which should be added the possibility of corruption in the Latin text) an investigator cannot always isolate the reason operating in the case of a given mistake: sometimes an extant Greek manuscript points to a palaeographical explanation; sometimes only careful examination of a translator's treatment of a word or expression where it occurs in other passages enables one to establish as probable one among a number of possible explanations; often one can only enumerate the possibilities and remain uncertain. All available evidence is utilized by Lundström in his discussions of problematic passages, and these discussions

admirably illustrate an approach which is to be commended to future investigators in this field, though the reader may not always agree with the explanations here favoured.

The same awareness and clear discussion of possibilities mark the examination of those types of error which are treated fully in the second, syntactical, part (pp. 199-278): omissions here result from Lundström's preoccupation with 'krassere Übersetzungsfehler' (cf. p. 12). Errors of syntax due to palaeographical error of the types treated in pp. 19-73 occupy Ch. i (pp. 201-6), those due to homonymy Ch. ii. (pp. 207-11). Ch. iii gives some instances of error involving pronouns (pp. 212-3), Ch. v of error of Number (pp. 238-9). Ch. iv treats casual error (pp. 214-37—especially the Genitive case, pp. 214-26, which often afforded difficulty). Ch. vi deals with Gender, pp. 240-74. Ch. vii (*Genera Verbi*) illustrates the interpretation of middle forms as passive (pp. 275-6) and the reverse error (pp. 276-7), and deponent forms in Latin due to Greek deponent forms (pp. 277-8).

A word-index (pp. 284-300) lists 732 Latin words and 747 Greek—a modest 'Skizze' for the highly desirable 'Wörterbuch der Übersetzungsfehler' (cf. p. 12 f.). The subject-index (pp. 279-84), together with the clear list of contents, makes this valuable book easy to use, as does the generally adequate provision of cross-references in the text.

The book furthermore has an incidental value in making conveniently accessible material illustrating palaeographical errors, of a kind to stimulate the interest of (and sometimes entertain) the novice in this field, if it were put in his way. Mention, too, may be made of the light now and again thrown on the scholarship of St. Augustine and St. Jerome. Finally, Lundström himself expresses the hope that, as translations loom large in the earliest period of the vernacular literatures, the modern-language philologist also may find in this work something of interest.

University of Manchester

D. R. BRADLEY

VULGAR LATIN

KARL VOSSLER: *Einführung ins Vulgärlatein*. Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von HELMUT SCHMECK. Pp. viii+215. Munich: Hueber, 1954. Paper, DM. 11.80.

HELMUT SCHMECK: *Aufgaben und Methoden der modernen vulgärlateinischen Forschung*. Pp. 34. Heidelberg: Winter, 1955. Paper, DM. 3.

KARL VOSSLER, who occupied the Chair of Romance Language and Literature in Munich from 1911 to 1938, and who was recalled from retirement to be Rector of the University in 1945, was not primarily a student of language. It was by his work on Dante, on the Troubadours, and on Spanish literature that he won his unique place among German Romance scholars.¹ It was his custom, however, from 1913 until his retirement, to give an introductory course of lectures on vulgar Latin every year. These have now been edited from his posthumous papers by his pupil Helmut Schmeck. The editor has confined himself to making minor changes of style in converting the spoken to the written

¹ Cf. the sympathetic study of Vossler by his pupil and successor, G. Rohlf, 'Zur Erinnerung an Karl Vossler', *Z.R.Ph.* lxviii (1950), 456-64.

word, adding a few factual supplements, and bringing the bibliography up to date.

The main chapters of the work deal with the spread of Latin, the sources of our knowledge of vulgar Latin, phonology, morphology, word-formation, and Germanic influences. There are two very short chapters on topics of special interest to classical scholars, viz. 'Innere Geschichte des Lateins und besonders des Vulgärlateins' (pp. 48-54), and 'Vulgärlateinische Syntax' (pp. 181-9). The latter is mainly devoted to a rather general discussion of word-order.

Vossler's lectures were not intended to be an exhaustive survey of the field, but rather to give his students a preliminary bird's-eye view of the territory over which they would later have to pick their laborious way, and above all to transmit to them some of their teacher's enthusiasm and width of vision. In this latter aim they must have been outstandingly successful.

In these lectures a Romance philologist talks to Romance philologists, and much of them is beyond the competence of the present reviewer to pass judgement upon. When Vossler speaks of vulgar Latin, it is clear that he is thinking in the main of the spoken Latin of the late empire and afterwards, as reconstructed from all sources, including the Romance languages. The work that has been done in recent years, particularly by Löfstedt and his pupils, in distinguishing different stylistic levels in classical texts, is only of interest to him in so far as it contributes to our knowledge of this late spoken Latin. So the classical scholar will feel a certain lack of historical depth in his treatment.

Vossler, the lifelong friend of Benedetto Croce and translator of several of his works, was a champion of the neo-idealist school, and saw the driving force of linguistic change in a changed 'way of thought'. 'Der antike Mensch', he says on p. 153, 'übt ein sinnendes Schauen, der moderne ein schauendes Sinnen'. On p. 152, 'die individualisierende Anschauungsweise, d. h. die Neigung, das Individuelle des Einen mit dem des Andern zu vergleichen, das So und So-hafte, So und So-mäßige an den Menschen und Dingen herauszuheben' is made to explain, along with certain linguistic changes, the deification of Roman emperors and the cult of martyrs and relics. There is something in this. Men did think differently in the Dark Ages. But the connexion between the changed way of thought and its alleged linguistic effects is hard to discern, and tends to get lost in a mist of words. 'Der Gedanke, daß etwas umso realer ist, desto abstrakter es ist, daß die Werke, nicht die Dinge, das Sachliche, nicht das Sächliche die eigentliche Wirklichkeit auf ihrer Seite haben, ist im sprachlichen Denken durch den Untergang des Neutrums vorbereitet' (p. 108). It has been said, perhaps not inaptly, that Vossler was more a poet than a scholar.

In the quotation of vulgar Latin forms it is not always clear what is attested and what reconstructed: e.g., on p. 159 the suffix *-aria* seems to be an inference from Romance forms, while *-idjare* is an actual Latin form (*baptidiare* in Apicius, Theodorus Priscianus, the *Peregrinatio Aetherae*, and late inscriptions, *catomidiare* in the S.H.A. and conjectured in Petronius, *citharidiare* in Fulgentius, etc.). But this does not emerge from Vossler's words.

Among the sources of our knowledge of vulgar Latin no mention is made of Latin words borrowed by other languages, but not attested in Latin texts or in the Romance languages, e.g. **spicarum* > O.H.G. *spīhhāri*, Germ. *Speicher*. Late Greek contains some interesting material of this kind.

Now to some minor slips. It was not the historian Pompeius Trogus, but his father, who was Caesar's secretary (p. 34). Jerome's dream is recounted in

ep. 22, not *ep.* 18 (p. 53); dictation was not common in monastic scriptoria (p. 60); it is not the case that in indirect statements introduced by *quod*, the verb is in the indicative if the statement is true, in the subjunctive if it is not (p. 206).

Vossler's book is a highly individual and stimulating introduction to its subject. Schmeck's pamphlet is the German version of a lecture given in several Italian universities in 1952 (the Italian text of which was published in *Atene e Roma*, iii (1953), 8 ff., though this is not mentioned in the present work). Of its two sections, the first discusses the nature of the vulgar Latin from which the Romance languages were derived, and comes to the sensible conclusion that it was the ordinary spoken Latin tongue, used unselfconsciously by all classes, and neither a distinct language from classical Latin nor a kind of argot or slang. In the second section he deals with problems of vocabulary. He divides the word-stock of vulgar Latin into three groups: words attested both in Latin and in the Romance languages, e.g. *caballus*, *mansio* = *domus*, *camsare*; words attested in Latin but not in the Romance languages, e.g. *chiramaxium*, *gaudimonium*, *ingens* = *multum*, *apoculare*; and words surviving in the Romance languages but apparently not attested in Latin, e.g. **amurcula*, **assicella*, **auridiare*. We are now in a position, he says, to re-examine the third group and find etyma for many of the starred forms. The second group, he believes, can be considerably extended by establishing those 'constellations' of authors who alone use words recognized as vulgar on external grounds, and then ascertaining what other words are used by them alone. This procedure is briefly exemplified on pp. 31-33.

This kind of research can only be carried on fruitfully by those who, like Schmeck, have broken down the academic barriers between the Romance philologist and the latinist. This is perhaps the main message of an interesting lecture.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

LATIN METRE

FRIEDRICH CRUSIUS, HANS RUBENBAUER: *Römische Metrik, ein Einführung*. 2 Auflage. Pp. vi+148. Munich: Hüber, 1955. Paper, DM. 8.70.

It is some twenty-six years since the appearance of Crusius's useful book, and a new edition by Hans Rubenbauer is very welcome. In size and scope this second edition is very like the first. The pages are slightly larger and slightly fewer; the chapter and section divisions, though in certain cases rearranged, are in the main the same. After a short introduction comes a chapter on Prosody; this is followed by one dealing with such matters as caesura, diaeresis, rhyme, and the like. Next comes a long chapter on the various metres and *cola*, a fifth one being devoted to verse in strophic form. Two final chapters give an account of, respectively, accentual verse and prose rhythm. There is a new section on 'Ictus and Accent', but in general the part of the book devoted to dramatic verse has been cut down by some twenty pages. This is all to the good, and indeed more might with advantage have been excised, in particular sections dealing with certain 'laws' of whose validity one cannot help feeling some doubt. However, in this matter it must be conceded that Crusius is on the

side of the big battalions. In other than Plautine versification, indeed, determinism in metrical theory causes a certain amount of unnecessary spilling of ink, as when, for instance, we are told (p. 81) that 'in Hor. C. 2. 18 the first syllable of the (iambic) lines is with two exceptions short, while in C. 1. 4 it is with one exception long'. These lines, being catalectic iambic trimeters, have their first syllable *anceps*; and that, one would think, is all that need be said about them. It is refreshing to find Crusius stating categorically that the Latin accent was never a pitch one, and that the Saturnian is a quantitative and not a stress metre. He is widely sceptical about onomatopoea (p. 49) and about rhyme; though *à propos* of internal pentameter rhymes he is weak—and illogical—enough to qualify his *zufällig* by *meist* (p. 59). And, by the same token, to say that a monosyllabic ending to the pentameter occurs *ganz selten* is an understatement.

I find some of Crusius's *dicta* puzzling: (i) p. 15, 'in the classical poets iambic words are scarcely ever elided, cretic and spondaic words seldom'. Can he really mean to equate elided cretics and spondees in the matter of rarity as, so writing, he seems to do? (ii) p. 34, 'the *colon* in the strict sense does not end with a *syllaba anceps*'. (iii) the remark on p. 56 that the relatively great number of elisions in the *Aeneid*—he contrasts the hexameters of Ovid and Lucan—may be an indication of the unfinished state of the poem'.

Crusius is generous in the citation of examples; but in a book written, as he explains in his Preface, *besonders für Anfänger*, it would have been a kindness sometimes to mark off the feet. Not every 'beginner' will at once recognize *capias restim ac te suspendas cum ero et vostra familia* as a trochaic septenarius, or *quid faceret? si amabat, rogas quid faceret? adservaret* as an iambic one. But all scholars, be they beginners or not, will find much that is of real value in this book.

Brasenose College, Oxford

MAURICE PLATNAUER

A MARXIST APPROACH TO THE PRE-SOCRATICS

GEORGE THOMSON: *Studies in Ancient Greek Society*. Vol. ii: *The First Greek Philosophers*. Pp. 367; 10 maps. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1955. Cloth, 27s. 6d. net.

THIS volume, like its predecessor in the series (which was reviewed by Professor H. J. Rose in *C.R.* lxiv [1950], 127-9), is a work of very great interest which will fascinate some, and, in accordance with the undoubted intention of the author, will exasperate far more. For of course it presents an avowedly Marxist analysis of Greek society. The jargon of communist dialectic is both repulsive and at the same time to a very large extent unfamiliar to many classical scholars, and there is perhaps a danger that Professor Thomson will be credited with a perverse originality for much of what is in fact simply the now traditional doctrines and categories of thought developed in the nineteenth century by Marx and Engels and later crystallized in the writings of Lenin. Of much more importance are the ways in which the author in part breaks free from what is merely traditional in the Marxist approach.

The treatment of the Pre-Socratics has clearly caused Professor Thomson a

good deal of trouble. On the one hand, he is committed by his principles to the view that bourgeois thinkers are necessarily incapable of understanding the true nature of the history of Greek thought, or of any historical process whatsoever. On the other hand, the bourgeois Cornford arrived at a picture of the origins of Greek philosophy which was historically superior to that which anyone else has so far reached, whether bourgeois or Marxist. And Thomson is too good an historian to wish to deny this. In fact Cornford's view is the view which he wishes to adopt. *From Religion to Philosophy* was the title of Cornford's first book on Greek philosophy. Small matter that the religion was that of the hypothetical primitive tribe of Durkheim—the essential vision was already there, no small achievement when Zeller and Burnet were on the other side. Cornford's work at the end of his life carried the story a step farther, by showing that the religion from which philosophy developed was as much the religion, or rather religions, of Asia Minor and the Near East as that of the primitive tribe. (It is quite wrong to say as on p. 170 that Cornford 'never got beyond Durkheim'.) The essentials of Cornford's view are what Thomson knows to be right—what then can he do? It is this which provides the tension of the present book and the answer may be expressed in a quotation referring more particularly to Cornford's discussion of the Theogony of Hesiod and the Babylonian Enuma Elish (p. 140). 'It falls short, as we shall see, of a full solution to the problem, but even so it shows that he was far in advance of any other bourgeois historian of philosophy. Its limitations are the limitations of bourgeois philosophy itself.'

How, then, does Thomson proceed to pass beyond the limitations of the bourgeois picture of the history of early Greek philosophy? Rather unexpectedly in two ways. First, resuming material published in *J.H.S.* in 1953, he tries to add to the evidence for the ultimate religious origins of Ionian thought by postulating a hieratic tradition to which Thales and Anaximander were direct heirs as members of ancient families of priest-kings. The arguments seem to me quite unconvincing, though I cannot discuss the question here. In any case the probable theogonical framework for much of early Ionian speculation rests on quite other evidence than this. Secondly, and this is much more important, Thomson asks the vital question—assuming a religious origin for Greek speculation, how is its strong rationalist tendency to be explained, and what were the historical reasons for the movement from religion to philosophy? The approach to this question is the central theme of the book. Rejecting out of hand the possibility of any explanation in terms of the free working of the human intelligence or of chance, Thomson starts from the Marxist postulate that all speculation is rigorously controlled by preconceptions derived from the structure of society. So be it. The problem, then, is to explain the growth of Ionian philosophy in terms of the changing structure of society. The main lines of the answer given seem to be these. It is only when primitive communism has been followed by the division of society into classes that speculation develops, and then only among the ruling classes who alone have leisure for such matters. It will then be natural that the content of the speculation will reflect the particular class structure of the society which produces it. This class structure is related to the system of production, though we are reminded on the authority of Stalin that this relation need be neither immediate nor direct. Professor Farrington explained the positive content of early Greek thought in terms of the techniques used in production in the period in question. This cannot be

correct, since Sumerians and Egyptians had the same techniques but no rationalist philosophy. The answer must lie in 'the new developments in the relations of production which by transforming the structure of society had generated a new outlook on the world'. Again so be it. We look forward to a forthright Marxist answer in these terms, an answer which we might discuss and accept or reject. Unfortunately we do not get it. What we find, unless I am mistaken, is an uncomfortable shuffling backwards and forwards between a number of different explanations in terms of the structure of early Greek societies, which neither separately nor together can provide an acceptable answer on Marxist premisses and for Marxists, let alone for bourgeois historians. Greek philosophy, we are asked to conclude, arose because the Greeks developed a ruling merchant class based on slave labour. True, a leisured class had existed elsewhere, but they failed to develop philosophy because, at least in Mesopotamia and Egypt, 'this was a priest-ridden class of landowners preoccupied with the struggle to control those economic forces which eventually brought the merchant class to power'. It is, then, the development of a ruling merchant class which is the vital factor. But there were other merchant states apart from the Greeks—what of the Phoenicians? Some Marxists believe that they too developed philosophic interests—the supposed example of Sanchuniathon is mentioned. But Thomson says nothing of this, nor does he say directly in what the Ionians differed from the Phoenicians. But he regularly speaks of the feature which distinguishes the Ionian communities from all others as being the exchange of commodities as developed after the invention of coinage. We would then have to suppose that it was the addition of the coinage to the other social and economic factors which caused the rise of philosophy. Strange, perhaps, but not altogether impossible. But why, then, did not the spread of coinage throughout the Mediterranean to other merchant slave-owners produce independent non-Greek philosophic movements? This question is not, I think, ever raised by Thomson. Certainly it is never fully discussed. Instead we seem always to have alongside the mention of money a good deal of matter explaining Greek philosophy in terms of slavery and the activities of a merchant ruling-class. This matter is often of great interest, but it cannot, it would seem, help us to answer the question, why did philosophy first begin with the Greeks?

University College, Swansea

G. B. KERFERD

HELLENISTIC SCHOOLS

MARTIN P. NILSSON: *Die hellenistische Schule*. Pp. xi + 104; plan, 8 plates. Munich: Beck, 1955. Paper, DM. 9 (Cloth, DM. 12).

It is the extraordinary, not the familiar, events, not institutions, which tend to provide the stuff of history. Because of the familiarity of the everyday equipment of their lives, Greek authors took this for granted, and seldom needed to refer to it even *en passant*; it was common ground for the writer and his public. The result has been to impoverish our knowledge of what must have been the most accepted and routine features of society and to deprive us of an adequate background against which to set recorded ideas and events. And nowhere is this more effectively made clear than in this excellent little book.

The boys' public schools (education for girls is barely mentioned), the courses and activities of the *gymnasia*, must have been a well-known part of the

routine of life in the Greek city of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, at least as far as the better-off citizens were concerned; the *paides*, *epheboi*, and *neoi* all took part in state ceremonies, and Professor Nilsson several times emphasizes the important fact that school-life was the more effective as a training for citizenship simply because instruction took place in public, and the students were already integrated into public life; whereas modern school children are shut into special buildings and enclosures away from the contacts of adult municipal affairs. Yet literary evidence for the administration of the *gymnasium* and the instruction given in it is to all intents and purposes completely lacking. Such knowledge as we have must be assembled piecemeal from the chance survivals of epigraphic records, often fragmentary, from diverse parts of the Greek world, and scattered also through the half millennium during which the schools may be said to have flourished. In the case of Egypt, there is also the evidence of papyri. And these sources are liable to illustrate the details, while taking the general principles for granted.

Nilsson handles this unpromising and difficult, but at the same time fascinating, material with a masterly touch, eliciting what contributions he can from it towards a general account of the 'Hellenistic school'—a replacement, in the light of modern research, of Ziebarth's *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen*. It is presumably intended as a synthesis for a student or general reader; at least, Greek is usually quoted in translation, and where the actual Greek words are important they are transliterated. Scholarly controversy is avoided, save that Nilsson swerves from the path of descriptive exposition in order to combat the opinion of Marrou (*Histoire de l'Éducation*) that three years of 'literary education' intervened between the age-group of *paides* and that of *epheboi*, three years when physical exercises in the *gymnasium* lapsed (pp. 34-40); quite apart from the inherent improbability of this supposition, Nilsson's arguments appear convincing and conclusive.

The author acknowledges that the poverty of the material makes it difficult to create a general picture, though he is not thereby deterred from the attempt; *behaupten* and *vermuten* are the keywords. But the result provides as workable an hypothesis as can at this stage be suggested—provided always that it is regarded as such. For the clarity and skill of the exposition leave the very real danger that this little book may be read as more definitive or more universally applicable in its various details than it is. M. I. Finley expressed well a warning against the assumption that 'one may draw upon any document written in Greek, regardless of time or place, in a study of "Greek" institutions' (*Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens*, p. viii). To that may be joined a rider that, having drawn upon them, one should not try too hard to make them 'add up'. To take two instances from Nilsson's book: of the two examples of the founding of a school one (from Teos) may reflect, as Nilsson says, peculiar circumstances; and there is no reason to regard the other (from Miletus) as necessarily representative. The *gymnasium* as a centre of Hellenism in the Seleucid empire is rightly stressed, but the whole picture must be based on two inscriptions from Parthian Susa, a reference in the *Maccabees*, and a scathing remark quoted from Posidonius.

What material does exist is laid under heavy contribution, and the same inscriptions return in the course of the book to provide evidence under the different sections, on gymnasiarchs, *paidonomoi*, competitions, age-groups, etc., into which the main part of the work is divided. The opening thirty pages

discuss education in archaic and classical times and the Athenian ephebate. A closing section deals with Syria and Egypt. There is also a short description of the buildings of a *gymnasium*, based on those at Priene and Pergamum. One might at times doubt the special relevance of what is discussed; e.g. a short survey of ruler-cult is occasioned by no more than the fact that school-children took part in the celebrations; but the presentation is lively and interesting throughout.

Poor though the material is, there is more of it than is specifically quoted, and much lies behind some of Nilsson's casual pieces of information. The additional references would have been welcome. On p. 57, for instance, he refers to the three instances of women gymnasiarchs quoted by C. Forbes (*Néoi*, p. 22, not p. 20) and adds 'Es gibt noch andere'. *I.G.R.R.* iii. 801/2 might be added, for example—but how many has Nilsson in mind? And not only ephebes became gymnasiarchs (loc. cit.); one might mention Cn. Claudius Pulcher of Epidaurus, who served at the age of four (*I.G.* iv². 1. 652/3). Since the author must have had all this material at his command, one could have wished for something like Table i in Forbes's book to set it all before us.

The careful reader's enjoyment of this book may be a little tempered by the inadequacy of the indexes [(a) *Inschriften*, (b) *Personen und Sache*]. To quote some samples, in (a) no references are given for the frequently quoted and important *Milet* I. iii. 145 (*Syll.*³ 577); *Syll.*³ 578 (as quoted in the footnotes) is confused with *O.G.I.S.* 309; *S.E.G.* ii. 584 (p. 51) and *I.G.* xii. 7. 447 and 515 (p. 66) are not indexed at all; references to *I.G.* ii². 1039 and *Syll.*³ 958 are incomplete. Missing from (b) are, among others, Queen Apollonis, Paullus Fabius Persicus, and Stertinius Xenophon. Places not occurring in (a), and papyri, achieve no mention at all. A short bibliography would also have been useful; those of Forbes and of Hondius (*Saxa Loquuntur*, p. 143) provide a basis.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

A. G. WOODHEAD

ΠΟΛΛΑΙ ΜΟΡΦΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ

MARTIN P. NILSSON: *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Erster Band: *Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die griechische Weltherrschaft*. Zweite, durchgesehene und ergänzte Auflage. (Handb. d. Altertumswiss., v. 2. 1.) Pp. xxiii+872; 52 plates, 8 figs. Munich: Beck, 1955. Cloth, DM. 70 (paper, DM. 64).

It is not a bad testimony to a work which for fifteen years has been the chief book of reference for its subject that it needs so little revision at the hands of its critical and endlessly industrious author. About 50 pages have been added to the total length. Some of these are accounted for by new sections (on the Muses, pp. 253-5; on abstractions, pp. 812-15) and the recasting of the introductory section, now 67 pages long instead of 59, but most of them are made up of small changes and corrections, a new footnote here, a short paragraph or two there, in which material not yet available when the first edition came out is utilized, the treatment of some detail expanded or revised, very occasionally a statement of opinion or fact retracted on receipt of fresh evidence or on reconsideration of the old. For instance, p. 204, n. 8 puts the reader in possession of the results of investigation which relegate the supposed omphalos at Delphoi to the realm of honest mistakes; pp. 411-13 give Zeus Meilichios two new

paragraphs; p. 444, n. 2 sketches Schachermeyr's views concerning Poseidon and adds some interesting etymological considerations; p. 501, n. 1 etymologizes Ἀργεῖφόντης; p. 509 puts right a slight misrepresentation of a passage in Aeschylus; pp. 510-16, on Kronos, have been to some extent rewritten to bring in the new Hittite-Hurrite material; p. 580 and n. 2 revise the author's former views of Dionysos Liknites; p. 833 partly rewrites the account of Bendis. But by far the greater part of the work remains as it was in the first edition, because in the author's judgement (and in that of judicious readers) no alteration was called for. Naturally, minute printers' errors and trifling inaccuracies of statement have been silently corrected away. Three or four of the former remain, as on p. 195, where Iphthime lacks her second h, p. 340, where Iros is still Iris, p. 454, where the name of Aidoneus is still misaccented, p. 526, n. 2, where for ἀνατιθέμεναι read ἀνατιθέμενα, p. 637, n. 1, in which μέλει has an extra λ, and the new notes and other additions have a very few and very trifling flaws, not likely to mislead anyone, but conspicuous in a book for the most part so excellently printed. As to the latter, on p. 371, line 4 from the end, for *den Pfeil* read *den Speer*; on p. 647 it would perhaps have been well to adopt one of the emendations which make *A.P.* xiv. 71, 1 scan normally; p. 752, it is no longer quite true that we do not know the context of Aeschylus, frag. 156 Nauck², for it is lines 15-16 of the 'new' Niobe-fragment, perhaps most handily accessible in D. L. Page's *Greek Literary Papyri* i. On p. 797, line 9, there still exists some confusion in a translation (not Nilsson's own) of Theophrastus, *Char.* 16, for it is not his ritual bath in the sea but his visit to the Orpheotelestai that the *deisidaimon* repeats every month. A microscopic investigation might add one or two items to this list, truly a negligibly short one for a book of this size.

As, through no fault of either the editors or the reviewer, the first edition was not noticed in this periodical, it seems proper to give here a sketch of the whole volume. It begins with an admirable outline of the history of the subject during the last 150 years, and incidentally of those primitive elements of religion which stand somewhere in the background of every cult, even the most exalted. This ends with a good select bibliography. Now comes the first section (*Abschnitt*) of the main work, entitled *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Religion*, which sets forth with much clarity and the usual admirable sanity of this veteran writer what is meant, to a Greek, by such things as purity and impurity, sacred and secular, and what his fundamental conceptions were on such matters as gods and their images, holy places, death and the soul, divination, and other elements which go to make up the complex of ancient and indeed of any cult. This ends on p. 255. The next section, *Die vorgeschichtliche Zeit*, extends to p. 384, and of necessity contains little which is not discussed more fully in other works from the same hand, notably *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*. That little, however, is, as usual, very well informed. It includes a brief mention of the theories (they might almost be called pan-Mediterranean) of Pestalozza and other Italian researchers, p. 257, and another of Ventris's decipherment of Linear B (p. 343, n. 3, cf. 444), while the numerous archaeological references have been brought up to date. Section 3, *Die Götter*, occupies pp. 385-603. It divides them into 'old' (Zeus, Hera, Athena, Poseidon, Hades, Demeter, Artemis, Hermes, Kronos and the other Titans) and 'newer' (Ares, Aphrodite, Hephaistos, Apollo, Dionysos), ending with a brief account of immigrant gods in general, all those in the second category of course coming under that

heading. The concluding paragraph gives a brief and handy rule for determining the status of deities; the brothers and sisters of Zeus are those *von denen wir mit Sicherheit* [I would say rather *mit Wahrscheinlichkeit*] *behaupten können, daß die Griechen sie aus ihrer Urheimat mitgebracht haben*, but his children are foreigners with the sole exception of Hermes, some being Minoan, some immigrants. Sections 4 and 5 are an historical survey of the whole period, the former dealing with the archaic, the latter with the fully classical epoch. The Persian Wars are the dividing line. It is impossible to analyse them adequately here; I remark only that besides treating of such matters as oracles, Orphism, the relation of cult to the city-site, the arrival in historical times of new gods, and other relevant matters they include excellent accounts of individual authors, as Hesiod, the tragedians, Xenophon, and others, who from various angles throw light on Greek religious feeling. I suggest in passing that p. 647, n. 1, which states categorically 'gerade in Athen ist das Mitwirken Delphis [in constructing the calendar] sicher', might well add that Jacoby (*Atthis*, p. 287, n. 92) maintains the very opposite. Elsewhere, Nilsson is scrupulous in mentioning views which differ from his own.

Having brought down the story to the eve of Alexander's appearance on the scene, Nilsson sounds a note of warning which was timely when first he wrote it and is no less so now. We still can form (p. 844) no clear picture of what the average Greek of those times thought and felt concerning religious matters. If we wish to do so, we must avoid loose speculations and continue with minute and patient research.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

A NEW HANDBOOK OF ANCIENT RELIGIONS

Histoire des religions. Editée par MAURICE BRILLANT et RENÉ AIGRAIN. Tome 3. Pp. 443. Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1955. Paper, 1,750 fr.

This is part of a rather extensive work, planned to run to five volumes and to include, not all the religions of the world, but a wide and representative selection. The general tone of the contributors may be described, to judge from the present volume, as a highly cultured and broad-minded Catholicism, eager to find and emphasize anything in the religions discussed which resembles the writers' own beliefs or may be thought in any way to have led up to them; a personal equation easy to allow for.

The present volume contains four articles, one (pp. 7-147) on the religions of ancient Egypt, by Étienne Drioton, which I leave on one side as being outwith the scope of this journal; a brief account (pp. 149-61) by P. Demargne of the Minoan and Mycenaean cults, which is to be commended for its general good sense, factual accuracy, and refusal to indulge in ill-founded speculations; two more, respectively by E. des Places and P. Fabre, the former on classical Greek and the latter on Roman religion. These I consider in more detail.

Des Places manifestly is interested rather in ancient religious thought, popular and philosophical, than in the details of cult. Out of 144 pages (159-292), he devotes 22 to Homer and Hesiod, 10 to *les premiers penseurs*, 16 to Orphism and Pythagoreanism, 13 to Aeschylus and Aristophanes (the latter as a witness to the popular religion of his day), and 47 to philosophical thought from Socrates to the later Stoics and the Christian apologists, leaving him but 36 for everything else. It is thus a selective work which does not try to include

even an outline of all the relevant matter. As such, it is eminently readable, the tone being amiable (the reviewer feels rather drawn towards a writer who allows, p. 245, that there may have been some real miracles wrought at Epidauros, 'récompenses d'une foi sincère qui, avant l'Évangile connue . . . ne pouvait aller qu'à un Dieu inconnu') and the interpretations always interesting. Some details need correction or modification. P. 162, I am far from sure that the Athenians were 'descendants directs des Pélasges'; p. 163, a Mycenaean or Homeric megaron is not at all like a Cretan palace; p. 170, the Homeric *εἴδωλον* is not the 'double' of the soul, but the soul itself; p. 216, eternal bliss was rather what many initiates read into the Eleusinian rites than anything directly promised them—indeed the whole account of Eleusis is marred by rash statements; p. 221, there is nothing 'essentially Dorian' in the cult of Apollo; p. 222, the majority of the Delphic oracles were neither enigmatic nor equivocal, to judge by the specimens we have; p. 253, Athens certainly had a lively cult of Poseidon, Athena, and Apollo, but paid curiously little attention, by comparison, to Zeus.

P. Fabre's sketch of Roman religion (pp. 293-432) is for the most part sound and in accordance with recent investigations. Although he pays more attention than they really deserve to the opinions of Dumézil, he permits himself a healthily critical tone regarding them, and a like freedom is shown in his use of several other writers. His main defect is imperfect acquaintance with the literature, especially the periodical literature, in other languages than French. For instance, when discussing *numen* and *numina* (pp. 309 ff.), he seems not to have read Wagenvoort nor to be aware that nowadays no careful writer would misuse *numen*, as some Augustans and post-Augustans do, to signify even the most vaguely conceived deity; it is something which a deity has; on p. 316 he appears unaware that a good deal has been written about the Indigetes since Koch, and on p. 324 he mentions only the derivation of the name Faunus from *fauere* and accepts, what seems to me the mere fancy of some ancient theologian or grammarian, his connexion with the Lupercalia. On pp. 329 and 354 he seems to have no doubts about the personal *iuno*, despite the lack of anything like attestation of it before Augustus; pp. 344-5 repeat the old error that the pontifex maximus might enter the *penus Vestae*. P. 353, it certainly is no longer the common opinion that the Lar familiaris is an ancestral ghost; Fabre's own view is not only correct but generally accepted. P. 356 confuses tendance of the dead with ghost-worship. On p. 365, and several times elsewhere, Fabre is too ready to suppose the former existence of human sacrifice in Roman cult. P. 378 revives another old mistake; *hasta sanguinea* is a spear made of cornel wood, not one stained with blood or anything else. P. 393 seems to imply that the children born in a *uer sacrum* were still sent away to found a new colony in 217 B.C., though the text of Livy (xxii. 10) says nothing about them. But these are details; I repeat that the bulk of the essay is sound and good.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

ORPHISM

LOUIS MOULINIER: *Orphée et l'orphisme à l'époque classique*. Pp. 128. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper, 900 fr.

ON p. 8 of this book the author surprises us with the information that 'Hérodote connaît deux Orphées'. The reference is to fr. 42 Jacoby, and the matter is

cleared up on p. 19: 'Hérodore est net: selon lui, il y a deux Orphées.' Then was the reference to Herodotus just a misprint? Hardly, because not only does Herodotus recur on p. 105 ('Hérodote redouble Orphée'), but in the immediate context on p. 8 the author speaks of 'un autre passage du même Hérodote', referring to Herod. ii. 81. It may sound carping to start on this querulous note, but the author's whole justification for yet another book on Orphism rests on the need for accuracy, and the negligence in this respect—as he sees it—of his predecessors. We must let the documents speak for themselves; 'tenons nous en aux faits'; and in criticism of another writer on Orphism he admonishes us (p. 9 n. 1): 'Le respect des moindres détails est nécessaire.' This severity prompts one to point out further that the metope at Delphi showing 'Orphas' in a ship does not come from the 'trésor des Sicyoniens' (p. 8), but from an earlier monopteral building under the Sicyonian treasury,¹ and even to draw attention to the words: 'Le lexicographe byzantin Suidas, qui vivait . . .' (p. 74).

By letting the documents speak for themselves, and admitting only evidence applicable to the classical era, the author hopes to put an end to our bewilderment on the subject of Orphism in this period. The result, he says, may be little, but it will be the truth. Other authors before him have also tried (though he does not seem to think so) to base their accounts only on evidence from the relevant period, or at least on later evidence only so far as its content can be referred back with certainty to that period. It is of course on the question what later material can be so referred back that the main differences of opinion arise, and it might be expected that the new feature of M. Moulinier's treatment would be a refusal to admit later sources at all. This is not quite what we find. 'N'interrogeons', he writes, 'que les témoignages datant de l'époque classique et ceux qui peuvent nous donner sur elles des renseignements valables'. In the words here italicized he opens the door to speculation and dispute once again. True, he tries manfully to adhere to the meagre trickle of fifth-century and earlier testimony, but this does not deter him from citing Porphyry as the sole authority for his confident statement (p. 18) that abstinence from certain foods was a feature of Eleusinian initiation at the time when Euripides wrote the *Hippolytus*. He is arguing that the *ἀψυχος βορά* of *Hipp.* 952 is to be distinguished from the precepts of Orpheus, which only apply to *βακχεύειν*, and does not here mention Ar. *Frogs* 1072 or Plato, *Laws* 782 c. D. W. Lucas's article 'Hippolytus' in *C.Q.*, 1946, pp. 65 ff., might have helped his interpretation of this passage.

Moulinier is always inclined to a negative conclusion when all that the evidence justifies is suspension of judgement. For instance he takes the view that the *Τιτανική φύσις* of Plato, *Laws* 701 c refers not to the Orphic story known in full from Clement of Alexandria, but to the Titans as rebels against Heaven in Hesiod. His conclusion here is modestly worded: 'Nous n'avons pas le droit d'affirmer ici que la légende de Dionysos dépecé par les Titans est déjà connue' (p. 51). But on p. 59 he claims to have shown that the doctrine of original human impurity due to the Titans 'n'apparaît, dans un ouvrage de langue grecque, que quatre ou cinq siècles après Aristote', and, moreover, considers this sufficient evidence for asserting that it did not *exist* until well after the same period. Pausanias' reference to Onomacritus as the man who made the Titans

¹ I made the same mistake twenty years ago in *Orpheus and Greek Religion*. It was pointed out by Ch. Picard in 1936 and corrected in a note in the second printing.

responsible for the sufferings of Dionysus he sets aside as untrustworthy on the ground that Pausanias was relying on an 'Orphic' poem, which he thought was by Onomacritus though it was probably a much later work. That Pausanias' source was an Orphic poem, is, however, pure conjecture ('l'on peut être amené à penser', p. 47). But of course the lateness of our knowledge of the full story is no complete proof of its late origin, and when the assumption of its currency in classical times provides a natural explanation of several things—of the 'Titanic nature' of the *Laus*, Pindar fr. 133 Schroeder = 127 Bowra (Moulinier seems not to know of H. J. Rose's discussions of this passage in *Greek Poetry and Life*, 1936, and *Harv. Th. Rev.*, 1943), and possibly also (though Moulinier thinks otherwise) of the eschatological gold plates—it becomes no more justifiable to deny the early existence of the myth than to affirm it categorically.

Readers may be grateful for some amplification of the sentence which Moulinier quotes on p. 49 from Metzger concerning the r.-f. hydria B.M. no. E 246:¹ 'En réalité, comme Sir John Beazley nous l'a fait observer, il s'agit sur ce vase d'un scène de la légende de Lycurge et la présence de Dionysos n'a rien que de très normal.' To save them a hunt through the works of Sir John Beazley, let me say at once that Metzger's words refer to a private communication. Beazley's opinion is that the crudely rendered scene on this vase represents the mutilation of the dead body of Dryas by Lycurgus (*ἀκρωτηρίδας αὐτόν*, Apollod. *Bibl.* iii. 5. 1). Lycurgus holds one severed leg of his son in his right hand, and the rest of the body in his left. This may be so, but in view of Moulinier's insistence on the need to confine oneself strictly to classical evidence one wonders whether he has considered (1) that the words of Apollodorus are the only literary authority for the mutilation; the famous accounts of the punishment of Lycurgus in Hom. *Il.* vi. 130 ff. and Soph. *Ant.* 955 ff. do not allow for the murder at all, (2) that in art, although the murder of Dryas is shown on a vase of the mid-fifth century and another of the end of the fifth or beginning of the fourth,² neither of these suggests that the painter was aware of the mutilation which followed, and, so far as I know, the vase that we are considering would be the only extant rendering of the subject. As for Moulinier's immediately preceding remark—'Pourant, le point capital reste obscur: est-ce bien un enfant que le personnage central porte sur le bras gauche?'—one can only wonder whether he has looked at the vase at all. Unless it be a doll, the figure is as clearly a child as the others are adult male human beings.

This could be continued, but it should now suffice to say that this short book hardly fulfils its author's ambition to give us, once and for all, the facts about Orpheus and the Orphics. It leaves many of its predecessors' arguments unanswered, and adds nothing of importance to the more substantial work of Linforth, whose canon of evidence is at least as strict as Moulinier's, and his handling of it more scholarly.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

W. K. C. GUTHRIE

¹ Metzger, *Les représentations dans la céramique attique du IV^e siècle* (1951), p. 262, n. 3. The vase is illustrated in Guthrie, *Orph.* and *Gk. Rel.* (1935 and 1952), p. 131.

² For vases showing Lycurgus killing Dryas, see Beazley, *Greek Vases in Poland* (1928), pp. 44–46. The first vase mentioned above has been published in *C.V.A. Cracow*,

pl. 12. 1. For the second, see Cultrera, 'Hydria a figure rosse del Museo di Villa Giulia' (*Opere d'Arte*, fasc. viii, 1938). I owe these references, as well as the explanation of his own views, to the kindness of Sir John Beazley, who also states that the second vase is Attic, not Italiote as Cultrera says.

APOLLO IN ROME

JEAN GAGÉ: *Apollon romain*. Essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du 'ritus Graecus' à Rome des origines à Auguste. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 182.) Pp. 741; 8 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1955. Paper.

THIS huge and elaborate study falls into three parts which in turn are subdivided thus. Part i, 'Apollo Medicus', discusses in four chapters respectively the 'problème des origines' (from what source or sources did the cult, and the Sibylline oracles, reach Rome?), the cult itself and the temple in the Prata Flaminia, the relation of the god to patricians and plebeians, with an elaborate treatment of Camillus' piety towards him, and finally the earlier rituals of the *Ilviri S.F.*, down to about 350 B.C. Part ii, 'Ludi Apollinares', deals first with Tarentine and Italian influences from Pyrrhus to Hannibal, next with 'La crise oraculaire et l'institution des jeux Apollinares', then with Apollo as Numa's god and 'les "gentes" pompiliennes et les débuts de la propagande pythagoricienne'. Part iii, 'Regnum Apollinis', begins with Sulla, then has more to say about the Sibyl, next consecrates three chapters to Augustus, and finally treats partly of Nero, as a sort of ape of Augustus, partly, in brief outline, of the later history of Apollo down to Julian.

That there are many ingenious ideas and a great deal of learning in the work need hardly be said; the author builds partly on foundations laid by his teacher Carcopino and adds much of his own, besides numerous mentions of the ideas of other authors and, of course, plentiful quotation of ancient sources, literary, epigraphical, and numismatic. The judicious reader will be able to learn more than a little from him. But the work suffers from two grave defects. In the first place, it is unwieldily long. All that is really known about the Roman cult of Apollo, the Sibylline and other oracles, and the political and other movements known or supposed to have influenced the worship of the god could be adequately dealt with in about 100 of these large and closely printed pages. Secondly, much space is taken up by inverted pyramids of argument, in which a very little real evidence, such as a few lines of Livy or some other ancient author, a small series of coins or the like, is enlarged into elaborate accounts of what may possibly have taken place but is almost invariably a very long way indeed from being proved. 'Ce n'est là qu'une hypothèse', says the author (p. 273) and here and there in other parts of the book he warns his readers that he is not offering them certainties. Such a modest statement might serve as a motto for almost the entire work. I give a few instances, chosen from a much longer list compiled while reading through the monograph. The name of Dodona appears again and again up and down these pages, regularly as a source of religious ideas current in historical or proto-historical Italy, one might say as a fountain-head of religious propaganda which began early and ended late. Yet when the evidence for this view is examined (the main passages can readily be found in the index) it amounts to very little. A few legends of extremely dubious date and origin say that oracles from Dodona were given in 'Pelasgian' times; Aeneas in Dion. Hal. goes to Dodona and there Helenus meets him; Dodona inspired the ambitions of Pyrrhus, or so Gagé has argued elsewhere (p. 612, n. 1). It seems to me quite needless to assume either that the early influence of the ancient shrine on immigrants to Italy was very great or that it alone was

capable of combining the themes of the thousandth anniversary of the fall of Troy and the appearance of a new Achilles (whether Pyrrhus or another) in the curious speculations, partly theological and partly historical, which seem indeed to have been current in some circles in Rome. Certainly the few facts adduced do not suffice to prove either proposition. Again, the (neo-)Pythagoreans meet us at every turn. That there were such people in Rome, about the time of Cicero and Nigidius Figulus at all events, is a well-known fact; but some sort of valid argument that they were numerous or important, politically or intellectually, would be in place and I cannot find it.

Of small defects there is a great multitude, for Gagé is not always a trustworthy interpreter of the minutiae of ancient texts. For instance, Pliny, *N.H.* xvii. 243, informs us that near Cumae shortly before the civil wars between Caesar and Pompey a large tree *subsedit . . . paucis ramis eminentibus*, and this was felt to be a serious portent justifying an appeal to the Sibylline oracles. On p. 41 Pliny is said to speak of 'un arbre présentant trop peu de branches', which the most superstitious would hardly think portentous. P. 274 deals with the famous extract from the *carmina Marciana* reported by Livy, xxv. 12, in which the Romans were recommended to celebrate yearly games to Apollo *comiter*. The adverb is expanded into 'dans un esprit de cordialité fraternelle' and this interpretation is returned to elsewhere in the book. Does it mean more than that due courtesy was to be shown to all concerned, especially to the god? Furthermore, some old errors of interpretation persist; a rather glaring example is on p. 653, where the author still believes that the notorious *quinquennium Neronis* means the first five years of his reign. Many more such infelicities could be mentioned if space did not forbid.

But in fairness it must be stressed that there are good things throughout the book. The negative criticism is often acute, as for instance at the very beginning, when the too facile assumption that the Sibyl and ultimately Apollo came from Cumae, or chiefly from there, is shown to be full of difficulties. Another point well made, though I do not accept all details of the author's views, is that the Roman cult of Apollo (or for that matter any other naturalized foreign worship) was much affected by native Italian elements, old and new and originating in various parts of the mixed population of the peninsula. The speculations, for they are hardly more, regarding the attitude of sundry powerful families towards religious matters which are set forth especially in part ii are interesting, if nothing else; further research may lead to more assured results. And at every turn, even if one rejects all the interpretations offered, there is a plentiful supply of good material by the use of which the reader, if so inclined, may try to confute the author.

The book is set in good, clear type, but the proof-reading has been careless, witness the far too numerous small misprints which mar many pages.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

ROME AND VENUS

ROBERT SCHILLING: *La Religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste*. (Bibl. des Éc. Franç. d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 178.) Pp. 442; 32 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1954. Paper, 2,500 fr.

VENUS was clearly a goddess of deep national significance to the Romans. Lucretius in the first words of his poem invoked her as 'mother of the

descendants of Aeneas'; for Virgil she was both the mother of his hero and the divine embodiment of the destiny of Rome; Pompey dedicated his theatre to her under the cult-title *Venus Victrix*; Caesar on the field of Pharsalus vowed to her a temple, which he afterwards dedicated as part of his forum under the cult-title *Venus Genetrix*; Hadrian in A.D. 135 joined her with *Roma* in his great temple of *Venus Felix* and *Roma Aeterna* on the Velia. In classical authors Venus is, of course, to a substantial extent, the *interpretatio Romana* of Aphrodite. But the fact that, unlike Apollo, she is known by a native name would imply at once that there is a native element as well. The received account, supported by the great authority of Wissowa, is that this native Venus was in origin a garden-goddess, personifying charm, grace, or elegance (*venus*) in nature. But the incongruity, in this account, between the origin and the end-product would be more than striking and Schilling has no difficulty in demonstrating its improbability.

Schilling himself, in this stimulating and, at the same time, sensible work, puts forward a theory, which, if it is true, would call for a substantial revision in our common attitude to the whole religion of the Romans. Comparing the word *venus* with the seemingly related words *venenum*, *venenatum*, *venerium*, but especially with *venerari* and *venia*, he decides that the root-idea in *venus* is that of 'charme magico-religieux' (a notion which, however, he never analyses or explains). *Venerari* meant 'pratiquer le charme religieux'; *venia* expressed the response of the deity: 'les deux mots . . . correspondent aux deux mouvements complémentaires de l'attitude religieuse'. As a goddess, *Venus* was essentially the personification of the propitiation of the gods. This notion of an essentially reciprocal relationship between *veneratio* and *venia*, and of *Venus* as the personification of the two, is the key to Schilling's interpretation of Venus and of the 'Venerian' element in Roman religion. If his view is correct, that the divine response to *veneratio* was *venia*, in the sense of 'favour' or 'grace', it would obviously call for a substantial revision of the usual view that Roman religion was largely of a contractual nature, based on mutual *fides* between man and god rather than on belief in divine grace.

In support of his notion of a reciprocal relationship between *veneratio* and *venia*, Schilling cites four passages where *veneror* and *venia* occur together: *venerare Napaea*; *namque dabunt veniam* (Virg. *G.* iv. 535 f.); *Venerem . . . <venerabantur> . . . venia* (Apuleius, *Met.* iv. 28); the formula of *devotio* quoted by Livy (viii. 9. 7), *veneror veniam peto feroque*; and that of *evocatio* quoted by Macrobius (iii. 9. 7), *venerorque veniamque a vobis peto*. These passages would certainly suggest that the Romans felt that *veneror* and *venia* were somehow connected, but they do not suffice to establish that the relationship was an essentially reciprocal one. The case would be stronger if it were supported by adequate parallels, but, apart from several 'formations antithétiques *Genita Mana, Anna Perenna, Panda Cela*', which do not seem to cast any light on the problem, the only example which Schilling cites is the *obsequium* implied by Venus' cult-title *Obsequens*. *Obsequens*, he asserts, is also 'une notion bipolaire' which can refer both to the homage of man and to the goodwill of the deity. But there is nothing to suggest that the *obsequium* of a god—the expression apparently only occurs in Lucan v. 293 f. though we find *Juppiter Obsequens* and *Fortuna Obsequens* as well as *Venus Obsequens*—was essentially the response to the *obsequium* of the worshipper, nor, if it was, that the two attitudes were reciprocal rather than parallel.

No less interesting is Schilling's theory of the circumstances under which the

common noun *venus* became the goddess *Venus*. He argues that the development took place at latest by the fifth century at Lavinium (where Strabo records a federal Latin cult of the goddess) and that from an early date Venus was contaminated there with Aphrodite and, through her, associated with the Trojan legend—this would help to explain both the significance of Venus to the Romans and also their firm acceptance of the Trojan legend. Timaeus certainly indicates that the legend was at home in Lavinium in his time, but Schilling suggests that it should be carried farther back. He cites Solinus (ii. 14): *nec omissum sit, Aenean . . . ut Hemina tradit . . . in agro Laurenti posuisse castra, ubi dum simulacrum, quod secum ex Sicilia advexerat, dedicat Veneri matri, quae Frutis dicitur, a Diomede Palladium suscepit. . .* He argues that *Frutis* was an Etruscanized form of *Ἀφροδίτη* and that therefore a cult of Aphrodite must have been established at Lavinium during the period of Etruscan hegemony. Hemina, he argues, implies that this 'Venus' was from the beginning associated with the Trojan legend, and the possibility of this is shown by statuettes of Aeneas and Anchises found at Veii, indicating the presence of the legend in some form on Etruscan soil by the fifth century. The obvious weak point of the argument is the extent to which it depends on Cassius Hemina for the original significance of the cult of *Frutis*. Schilling is somewhat coy over Hemina's date: he contents himself with quoting Pliny's description of him as *vetustissimus auctor annalium* and makes no mention of the fact that one of his fragments refers to 146 B.C.

It was, according to Schilling, by virtue of her Trojan connexion that Venus came to be associated with the *Vinalia*, which he examines at considerable length. The ritual of the April festival included the pouring out of wine at a temple of Venus: this wine was 'une liqueur . . . chargée de vertu magico-religieuse' directed towards Jupiter. Since the wine was 'doué de la *venus*, du pouvoir extraordinaire qu'incarne la déesse', it would be natural for Venus to invade the festival, but her actual invasion of it, he declares, was through the aetiological myth, which, going back at least as early as Cato, derived the libation of wine from the vow made to Jupiter by Aeneas or the Latins—this is Cato's version—when about to join issue with the Rutulians. It should be pointed out, however, that none of the authorities for the aetiological myth mentions Venus as playing any part in it. Nor is the evidence cited for the magical significance of wine convincing: it includes Cato's recipe (*de agricultura* 114) for a purgative and treats as 'un texte capital' Isidorus' remark *veteres vinum venenum vocabant*.

Schilling deals in detail with Etruscan and Greek influence on Venus and with the various cults established at Rome, beginning with that of *Venus Obsequens*, established, according to Livy, in 295 during the third Samnite War. He interprets the cult-title as indicating that the goddess was 'accessible aux demandes, propice aux prières' (Wissowa had interpreted it as indicating that 'Venus die Geliebte dahin bringen soll, den Wünschen des Liebenden willfährig zu sein'). He draws a sharp distinction between the cults of the two temples of *Venus Erycina*: that on the Capitol, inside the *pomoerium*, established in 215, honoured her as a national Roman goddess, but that outside the Colline Gate, that is, outside the *pomoerium*, established in 181, was more exotic: it did not, indeed, have the temple prostitution of its Sicilian prototype, but it was a popular cult-centre of the prostitutes of Rome. The function of *Venus Verticordia*, who was given a statue before 204 and a temple in 114, is, he holds, rightly given by Valerius Maximus (viii. 15. 12) as *quo facilius virginum mulierumque*

que mens a libidine ad pudicitiam converteretur. Sulla's cognomen *Felix* he interprets as implying a peculiar devotion to Venus. Sulla 'a indiqué expressément l'interprétation qu'il entendait donner au surnom *felix*, par la traduction grecque 'ΕναφρόδITOS'. He had not apparently seen Balsdon's criticism of the arguments for this notion (*J.R.S.* xli [1951], 1 ff.), nor Erkell's *Augustus, Felicitas, Felix* (1952).

The book is copiously illustrated; it is remarkably free from misprints; but it calls for some further editing. The probabilities or possibilities of secondary authorities sometimes become certainties in transmission: e.g. in the case of Grimal on p. 18; of 'tous les linguistes' on p. 167; of *C.A.H.*, Plates iv, on p. 341. *Precor in nam vox me precantum huc foras excitavit* (Plaut. *Rud.* 259) has not, Schilling declares, a religious application (p. 54). But it would be unfair to stress minor errors in this original and, on the whole, careful study of a fascinating problem.

Queen's University of Belfast

M. J. BOYD

MYCENAEAN EPIGRAPHY

EMMETT L. BENNETT: *The Pylos Tablets: Texts of the Inscriptions Found, 1939-1954*. Pp. xxxii+252. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Paper, 40s. net.

In 1952 Professor C. W. Blegen was able to resume his investigation of the Mycenaean Palace at Epáno Englianos in Messenia which had been discovered by a joint Greek and American expedition before the war. The finding here of archives written on clay tablets in the Linear B script first proved that this was more properly a Mycenaean than a Minóan script; and the publication in 1951 of these texts, in a preliminary transcript made from photographs by Dr. Bennett, opened the way to its decipherment. Three seasons of work in the field (1952-4) and study of the originals have now added enough new tablets and improvements to published ones to justify the replacement of the earlier edition by an expanded version. The Concordance lists 370 tablets which do not appear in the earlier edition. Another season's work at Pylos—the name is amply confirmed by the tablets—has produced a few more tablets, but now that the archive room and its annex have been cleared it is unlikely that we can expect large additions to this body of material.

In a Foreword Professor Blegen describes the circumstances of finding and the physical appearance of the tablets. Bennett's Introduction is confined to the technical details of reproduction and transcription. The book itself consists of a plain text, first in the form of drawings of each tablet, and then transcribed into what has been called 'modern Mycenaean', a normalized Linear B script handwritten by Bennett. Finally in the index of sign-groups a concession is made to those who have yet to master the 88 signs, and each word is also transliterated in accordance with the system devised by Ventris and myself. The order, however, remains the arbitrary one devised by Bennett in accordance with the shape of the signs, and the beginner will probably find it easier to memorize $\vdash \vdash \ddagger \# \overline{\vdash}$, etc., than their equivalents *da, ro, pa, te, to*, etc. There is a table of phonetic values, from which Bennett wisely excludes some of the controversial cases; variant forms of the signs are shown,

and there is also a list of ideographic signs. In this review Linear B sign-groups will ordinarily be quoted in roman transliteration.

The wisdom of Bennett's decision to re-number all the 1939 tablets cannot be doubted as a long-term policy. The new numbers are the dig inventory numbers which are already on the originals. The prefix letters remain for the most part unchanged, but reclassification is now possible without disturbing the numerical reference, and the Pylos system is thus brought into line with that now used for Knossos and Mycenae. None the less, having regard to the considerable amount of work on the tablets already printed or in the press, not to mention many private card-indexes, it would have been charitable to smooth the transition by printing the old reference alongside the new, as will be done in this review. Instead the appropriate reference must be extracted from the concordances printed at the front of the book.

Verification of Bennett's readings against the originals in the National Museum at Athens, kindly made available by Dr. Karouzos and Professor Blegen, showed up only his astonishing accuracy and gift for reading difficult texts. We are lucky to have found in Bennett a meticulous scholar in whose work we can have the greatest confidence. The more important differences between his readings and those of Ventris and myself will be noted below, but these are almost all matters of opinion.

Certain criticisms may be levelled at the method of presentation of the texts; but when these are weighed against the need for a reasonably priced and rapid publication they will appear counsels of perfection rather than remediable defects. The drawings were made by 'tracing in India ink the lines of the stylus as they appeared in the prints of the photographs . . . They were then bleached and examined and corrected.' Reproduced on a scale of $\frac{2}{3}$ they present the appearance of line drawings. They make available, for the first time on a large scale, materials for the study of the handwriting of the scribes. Bennett has so far had this field to himself and can claim to be the founder of Mycenaean palaeography; his detailed analysis of the scribes of Pylos and Knossos, on the lines of those of Mycenae,¹ is eagerly awaited.

The drawings illustrate the layout of the tablets much more clearly than the transcripts, which omit the rules dividing the lines of the text, even where, as in Tn316 (formerly Kn02), they are significant. But they are no substitute for photographs. When the reading is in doubt they are all too often useless. They do not show all the marks visible on the photographs; those considered accidental by Bennett are eliminated, and where the photograph is not clear the drawing is frequently left blank. Thus it is still impossible—short of a visit to Athens—to control the transcripts. For instance at An661.4 the drawing shows:

[.] -o-ri [.] MAN 20

In the transcript this becomes:

ti-o-ri-jo ko-ro-ku-[ra]-i-jo MAN 20

It is encouraging to learn that Bennett is proposing to deposit sets of photographs in several international centres where they will be available for consultation. For a final publication, however, we must await the Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions, a project discussed by the recent international

¹ 'The Mycenae Tablets', *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* xcvi, 440-5.





Colloquium at Paris organized by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Meanwhile it would have been useful to have at least an up-to-date list of the references to journals in which photographs of individual tablets have been published, as on p. ix of the earlier edition.

Although the normal epigraphic conventions are now more closely followed, the absence of any sort of apparatus is regrettable. If Bennett is in doubt whether the true reading is, say, Λ or Λ , he has left himself no means of indicating the alternative, but must print one or the other with a subscript dot. The only notes he permits himself are to record erased readings where these are legible underneath the subsequent text. We should like to have brief notes of three facts about each tablet: (1) its physical condition—some are badly warped, cracked, or otherwise damaged; (2) its completeness—there is no indication in the transcripts when it is certain that lines are missing at top or bottom, and this is not always clear from the drawings; (3) any peculiarities of the handwriting, especially a change in the hand, e.g. at An39(18).6; evidence of hasty writing, e.g. Tn316(Kn02); and eventually a note of other tablets written by the same scribe.

We may also regret the policy which Bennett has adopted in dealing with obvious scribal errors. In texts which are still imperfectly understood it is of course hazardous to introduce corrections without the clearest evidence; but there are a fair number in frequently repeated formulae which can be corrected without qualms. Bennett has in fact noted these; but they appear, not in the text or a note to it, nor in the index under the erroneous form, but in the index under the *correct* form. There is no means of finding these short of going through the index looking for pointed brackets; unless one is able to make the correct guess independently. In one case at least Bennett has allowed his knowledge of the formulae to mislead him; at Jn601(02).9 there is no reason to correct *to-so-pa* to *to-so-de*; it represents *tossos pans*, the same totalling formula as appears at Knossos B 1055.9 as *to-so pa-te* (*tossoi pantes*); it is an almost invariable practice of the scribes to attach a monosyllable to an adjacent word.

Errors in the transcripts are very hard to find, but the following corrections should be noted: Eo276(03).1 read A^{\cdot} T^{\cdot} I^{\cdot} I^{\cdot} (cf. the parallel entry En74(03).1); Na103(75) for 16 the drawing shows clearly 26 and this is read in the first edition; Na529(62) for *ai-ki-ke-o* read *ai-ki-de-o*; Nn831(02).8 for *e-ko-me-ne-u* read *e-po-me-ne-u* (cf. *e-po-me-ne-we* (dat.) Vn851.6). There are a few small printing errors in other parts of the book: p. xxiv the first entry should be Ea01, not Ea301; p. 218 in roman transliteration read *re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo* for *re-wo-to-ro-wo-ko*; p. 244 read *ku-da-ma-ro* for *ku-ma-da-ro*.

Bennett has done a great deal to improve the readings of the earlier texts and has where possible restored lacunae. The recurrent formulae make this generally easy; but it would be sound practice to note the source of the restoration where this is not obvious. At An292(02).3 the reader might take some time to discover that the source of the restored reading is Aa792. A few hazardous restorations may be noted: e.g. Fn50(02).11 *85-[to]-ja-te-wo and Jn415(08).1 *ru-ko-a₂-[ke]-re-u-te*. It is questionable whether tablets which were deliberately cut in half before drying should be restored as a single whole, e.g. Jn431&433(03); it is probable that in such cases the unused part of a tablet was cut off and used for a separate text.

In conclusion a few variant readings based on autopsy, and some conjectures, may be offered; in every case the tablet is unclear and the true reading not beyond dispute. Aa96(19) *da-[mi-ni-ja]*, cf. Ad697; Ad142(02) for *wu-we-u* first edition had *ne-we-u* which may be right, cf. *ne-we-wi-ja* (fem.) Aa695, Ab560(20); Ad663 may join Ad674; Ad686.1 *o-u-pa-ro-ke-ne-[to]* (= *ou parogeneto*); Ae264(03) *du-ni-jo-<jo>*, cf. Ae8(02), Ae72(01); An298(08).2 *ra-pte-[[re]]*; An610.14 *we-da-ne-wo* MAN 20 (see drawing); An614.4 *ko-ro]-ku-[ra]-i-jo*; line 7 *a-pe-e-si*; An616(23) r. 1 *ku]-pa-ro₂*; An661.1 *e-ki-no-jo* (cf. Knossos Da1078); line 10 *ti-mi-to a-ke-i ma-re-u*; An830.6 *e-o* (for *e-so*); Cn418(23).4 HE-GOAT 3 WE 3 SHE-GOAT 3; Cn655.13 *i-re-jo* or *i-pu₂-jo?*; line 16 EWE (for RAM); Ea421(25) [*ko*] is not a restoration, but seems to be a half-formed sign; Eb149(37) and Eb940 may be parts of the same tablet, but do not join; Eb893 and Eb897 are parts of the same tablet, separated by a gap of at least five signs (this is proved by an accidental scratch, and cf. Ep301(01).10); Fn324(03).17 *pi-re-se-[u?]*; line 27 *e]-u-ru-po-to-re-mo-jo* (= *Euruptolemoio*); Jn389(04).6 the second quantity of BRONZE must be read as the same as the first in view of the summation in line 9, as Bennett showed;¹ Jn658.11 the reading seems to be TALENT 3 LB 20, though Bennett here has the correct arithmetic; Jn829(09).10 although the standard order of the 'nine towns' leads us to expect some case of *e-ra-to*, this does not agree with the traces which may be read as *ro-[u]-so*: this may be an alternative name of the same area, and seems to have had a *ko-re-te* as in Jo438(Kn01).9 we can also restore [*ro*]-*u-so*; Jo438(Kn01).3 *e-re-ε*; Ma397(17).1 *a-*85-ta₂* is very probable; Na384(07) divider in *do-ro-go so-wo-te* is very doubtful; Na514(49) Ventris restores [*ku*]-*pa-ri-so*, cf. *ku-pa-ri-si-jo* An657.8,10; Sa787.2 *pa-ra-ja* (for *pa-ra-wa*); Ta641. end of line 1 *no-[pe-re?]* (for ΤΡΙΠΟΡ); Tn316(Kn02) r. 10 *di-wo i-je-<re>-we* (not *di-we*); Un219(11).3 *ka-ru-ke* PE 2; line 8 *e-[ra]* U I; Un249(09).1 *a-re-pa-zo-[o]*; Un718.12 for   read  ; Vn19(05).7]-to (for]-ro): the addition of this new fragment, which I myself was able to place in Athens, permits the reconstruction of lines 5-9 as follows:

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|------|
| 5 | [a-pu ₂ (?) sa-pi-de] | 60 |
| | [a-ke-re-wa sa]-pi-de | 40 |
| | [e-ra]-to sa-pi-de | nn |
| | [ka-ra-do-ro] sa-[pi-de | nn |
| | [ri-jo sa-pi-de | nn]; |

Wa917.1 *o-da-sa-[to] a-ko-so-[ta]*.

¹ Amer. Jnl. Arch. liv. 215.

University of Cambridge

JOHN CHADWICK

GREEK PAINTING AND THE THEATRE

HEDWIG KENNER: *Das Theater und der Realismus in der griechischen Kunst*. Pp. 200; 30 figs. Vienna: Saxl, 1955. Paper, S. 98.

THIS book consists of two independent studies. The first starts from Schweitzer's thesis that the origin of the portrait lies in abnormal and apotropaic masks. It is probably true that individual portraiture is more closely related to caricature than to idealistic portraiture; the Homeric Thersites comes to mind,

and in the sixth century Bupalus's caricature of Hipponax, which may very well have been a grotesque, labelled Hipponax; in the fifth century Socrates' mask in the *Clouds* may well have been very like a satyr mask, and the satyr mask may have influenced his portrait. Schweitzer named certain types which show, if not individualization, at least deviation from the norm of Greek beauty, and Dr. Kenner discusses these in turn, pointing to masks wherever possible and noting connexions with drama. The general thesis, that ritual masked dances, occurring very early in different forms in many different parts of Greece, were one of the origins of drama and that the masks (whether superhuman, sub-human, old-human, or animal) at a later stage influenced caricature and so portraiture, is probable and worth documenting in detail and illustrating. Some of the details are less certain: p. 14, neither Arion nor Aristotle is evidence for satyr dancers (in the strict sense) before Pratinas; the best evidence is the large terracotta satyr mask from Samos in the British Museum (Higgins, no. 523) because it seems to have been the mould for a mask worn by a dancer; the existence of earlier small frontal satyr masks does not of itself necessarily imply dancers—they may have been apotropaeic; p. 16, is it necessary to assume an Attic comedy or satyr play on Linus as the inspiration of the Pistoxenos painter's skyphos (*A.R.V.* 576/16)? The painter has certainly dramatized the scene and the stylization of the nurse's face may well owe something to stage nurses, but that is perhaps enough; p. 20, it is still less clear that the negroes who appear in Attic art about 540–530 are influenced by the stage; we have no evidence for an Eastern chorus in tragedy or comedy before the Persian wars; p. 22, it is good that the eighth-century Tiryns Gorgons are brought into the discussion; they also were moulds for masks which were actually worn; p. 23, it is doubtful whether the curious monsters, Lamia, etc., have anything to do with the stage, but the following statement of principle is admirable: 'we are not dealing with clear illustrations in our sense. All that the painter has learnt from his workshop tradition as well as what he knows of the epic sources blends with the acted version'; pp. 29 ff. Dr. Kenner deals with various different kinds of dwarfs, Pygmies, Cabiri, Cercopes, padded dancers, etc., all of which have some relation to the drama or its pre-history. Most of this is very sensible and useful; but, p. 37, the figure before Heracles in the Centaur chariot on the Nikias painter's oenochoe (*A.R.V.* 848/22) in the Louvre is not a satyr; p. 43, Aristotle's σατυρικόν (*Poet.* 1149^a20) is interpreted as 'the whole complex of old burlesque fertility-dancers'; this is too wide because 'the whole complex' would include τὰ φαλλικά, which Aristotle regards as the origin of comedy, but it may be on the right lines and the position needs reconsidering with the new evidence about Archilochus and Dionysus (*Philologus* xcix [1955], 4 ff.); within this complex belong also the very ancient goat choruses from whom Dr. Kenner derives the name of tragedy; p. 46, Arion, she believes, used both a goat-chorus and a satyr-chorus, but here caution is indicated since the only male chorus which we know to have existed at Corinth in Arion's time is the chorus of padded dancers.

The second part, entitled 'the theatre and the representation of space in Greek art', is also well documented and illustrated, and makes many new points. It is perhaps difficult for one who was brought up on Pickard-Cambridge to be fair to a study which starts from and goes beyond Bulle, and this consideration should be borne in mind in reading this review. Dr. Kenner first deals with the Pompeian wall-paintings treated by Pickard-Cambridge in

Theatre 220 f. and refers the treatment of space, which she illustrates by admirable drawings, to the influence of the Hellenistic theatre. There are many difficulties: the absence of stage costumes from almost all the pictures, the absence of any reference to a painter painting for the stage between Agatharchus in the fifth century and Vitruvius, the fact that many of the pictures do not represent stage-scenes in the normal sense. The chief difficulty, however, is Dr. Kenner's belief (taken over from Bulle) that scenes were played inside a *thyroma*, a room with the front wall left out, which could be further subdivided. It is surely axiomatic that in a large open-air theatre the action must be as far forward as possible and as central as possible. *Thyroma* never means a room; its technical sense in the Hellenistic theatre is a panel filling the space between the stone pillars of the *skene* and sometimes containing a practicable door. These panels were painted with relevant landscape or buildings (which according to Vitruvius at one moment influenced house-decoration, e.g. the *cubiculum* at Boscoreale), but they can never, if the axiom is right, have shown an interior, and this rules out theatre influence for a large group of these pictures; it does not, however, exclude the possibility of free reminiscence of grouping and sets in, for example, the Iphigenia pictures. Of the pictures showing actors in costume the tragic actor, the poet seeking inspiration for a mask, the satyr-play rehearsal are surely not in the theatre; the Dioscurides old women (to be dated early in the third century by drapery, proportions, and cup-form) are on the stage, not in a *thyroma* (the table has to be removed in Menander fr. 385 (450)); so are the Dioscurides revellers (cf. Plautus, *Most.* 313 f.) and the soldier and slave (cf. Plautus, *Pseud.* 594 f.).

The next section brings the new and very interesting idea that certain Byzantine miniatures preserve a memory of fifth-century scenery. Certainly the arrangement of buildings, rocks, and caves in these miniatures could be a free adaptation of theatre scenery of a kind which may have lasted from the fifth century to the time of Lycurgus; whether illustrations of scenery could have been made in the early Hellenistic period and have been transmitted to Byzantium is a question for the experts. The use of canvas screens representing rocks in the fifth-century theatre is extremely probable, and they could have been made in various sizes. Dr. Kenner's discussion of the scenery originally used in the surviving plays is ingenious. By Pickard-Cambridge standards she is often too elaborate; in particular, that Prometheus' rock was erected on the roof and at the end of the play descended behind it, is surely impossible; the chorus could neither have danced on the roof nor talked to him from the orchestra. She often speaks as if doors in the fronts of the *paraskenia* were used, but unless the usual plans of the Periclean and Lycurgan theatres are hopelessly wrong (e.g. Pickard-Cambridge, *Theatre*, pp. 16, fig. 7, 155, fig. 52), an actor at one of these doors would be invisible to much of the audience and would have an awkward walk round the corner to the 'stage'.

In interpreting the south Italian vases with pictures inspired by tragedy she treats the so-called *aedicula* admirably, but when she deals with the pictures which seem to show action in the *paraskenia*, the pictures which show interiors (particularly the Apulian Pelops, the Assteas Heracles, and the Python Alcmena), and the pictures with a temple in the background, she abandons her admirable views on the painter's freedom of handling, which are quoted above (from p. 23). But the principle is as true of the fourth century as of the fifth, and probably of the Hellenistic age too. The painter always paints more

than the eye can see at any one moment in the theatre; he has his own memory of the story and is working in his own pictorial tradition; and he may only allude to an actual production in some comparatively small detail. But of course it is right to exploit his allusions to fill the gaps in our knowledge of the theatre.

A certain connexion between painting and the theatre is given by the Vitruvius note about Agatharchus and *skenographia* (perspective). Dr. Kenner points out both the various fifth-century reliefs and paintings which show buildings in perspective, and discusses the theory of perspective. She notices Rumpf's suggestion that Agatharchus' *skene* was for a revival rather than an original production of Aeschylus; a date in the thirties would suit our other information about Agatharchus and the monuments; his commentary must have been written before the death of Anaxagoras in 428. All in all, although one may disagree at many points, this is a thought-provoking book.

University College, London

T. B. L. WEBSTER

HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE

MARGARETE BIEBER: *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*. Pp. xi+232; 712 figs. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Cloth, 140s. net.

HELLENISTIC sculpture has been out of fashion since archaeologists began to analyse style closely, and its study has been partial or perfunctory. Yet in the expression of feeling and movement and in composition it advanced beyond the limits of Classical art and, as Bieber observes, has had the greater influence on European statuary since the Renaissance. But though urgent, the complete study of Hellenistic sculpture is difficult. Till the fourth century Greek art had developed in a surprising uniformity, gradually reaching full technical mastery of its materials. In Hellenistic sculpture virtuosity was added and very different trends appear. The first problems are to distinguish these trends, to determine when and how each developed, and to decide whether they were peculiar to particular local schools.

Bieber begins with a quick survey of the Hellenistic world and the characteristics of its art. Next, as a necessary preliminary, she examines the sculpture of the later Classical period, by which she means principally the work of Praxiteles and Scopas. The third chapter considers Lysippus as the originator of Hellenistic sculpture. Then come chapters on 'Atticism' in the late fourth and early third centuries B.C., 'Asianism' in the third century, the art of Alexandria, the art of Priene, the art of Pergamum, Rhodes, and the South-West of Asia Minor, Rococo trends, and Classicism in the second and first centuries B.C. A short final chapter provides the conclusion. There follow a chronological table of historical events and historically dated sculptures, a selected bibliography fifteen columns long, and a good index. It will be seen that Italy is omitted, in spite of the Pasitelean school of the first century B.C.

A healthy liking for Hellenistic art and a wide, though of course not complete, erudition equip Bieber for her formidable task. Her weaknesses are a lack or omission of detailed argument and a rather glib acceptance of political and social influences. As a result much of what she says remains unconvincing and even her broad divisions are not beyond reasonable doubt.

Bieber accepts the fashionable opinion that Lysippus initiated Hellenistic sculpture, both in 'ideal' figures and in portraiture, and so she gives an account of his significant works. But she conceals the uncertainty about the attribution of these works and the consequent uncertainty about Lysippus' style. There is indeed a case for rejecting even the Apoxyomenus. The literary testimonies too are ambiguous. It is, for instance, dangerous to claim that Lysippus pursued 'naturalism'—if by that is meant the representation of individual traits—on the evidence of the advice quoted by Pliny (*N.H.* xxxiv. 61) *naturam ipsam imitandam esse, non artificem*: the meaning of *natura ipsa*—or rather, since Pliny is translating from the Greek, of *ἡ φύσις αὐτῇ*—is ambiguous. On the date and development of Lysippus important and different arguments have been published by E. Sjöqvist (*A.I.A.R.S.* ii. 87-97).

In her division of Hellenistic sculpture into local schools Bieber makes more modest claims than some scholars. But perhaps she still 'claims too much. At Alexandria sculptures have been found that are very softly modelled, but firm modelling too is found at Alexandria and soft modelling elsewhere, so that softness may not be a peculiarity of an Alexandrine school. Again genre subjects are widespread in the Hellenistic world and there is no reason to attribute them particularly to the Alexandrines. Pergamum is famous for the 'baroque' reliefs of the Great Altar and for the dedications of the Attalids, but 'baroque' sculpture is not confined to Pergamum and the sculptors of the admirable altar came from various parts of the Greek world. I am not quite clear what Bieber means by 'rococo', but sentimental, sensual, and genre works are widely distributed and, as Bieber justly observes, were made at the same time as 'baroque'. The reasons for attributing to 'Asianism' compositions of two or more sculptured figures are not clear to me, the division entitled 'the art of Priene' is positively misleading, and the continuing importance of the classical tradition deserves more emphasis. Here Rumpf's convincing paper on the Idolino (*Critica d'Arte*, xix-xx. 17 ff.) should be added and digested, even if the Idolino itself can be regarded as peculiarly Italian. The summary statement that Bieber makes on p. 157 seems to me about as much as can properly be said, anyhow for the present: 'While baroque and rococo tendencies prevailed during the Hellenistic period in the Eastern countries, Attica . . . kept to the tradition of its great past, the classical period of the fifth and fourth centuries.'

A sample of minor comments is enough. P. 58: Bieber accepts without hesitation and perhaps without realizing the consequences Pausanias' assertion that there was a portrait of Aeschylus in the picture of Marathon in the Stoa Poikile. P. 66: though she regards the Demosthenes as a posthumous psychological interpretation, Bieber still thinks that his features were probably known forty years after his death: this is perhaps allowing much to verbal description from distant memory. In general Bieber's attitude to the earlier portraits seems to show too much willingness to believe: if the portraits of famous men have the features and expressions which we expect from their works, that seems to me almost a better reason for rejecting than for accepting the verisimilitude of those portraits. P. 63: the appreciation of the Apollo Belvedere is just and timely. P. 77 and Fig. 271: the transference of the altar much improves the composition. P. 125: Bieber should have explained why the Nike of Samothrace is 'certainly' by Pythocritus, described the spectacular and carefully casual setting, and added that the date is now secured by associated finds. Pp. 149-50: it is always welcome to find an expert who denies the influence of painting on

the pos-
compos

This
is often
accomp
preh
In the
produc
reliable

Museum

W. D.
Publi

PROF
sugge
starti
author
phase
carrie
the st
had a
critic
time
lems
espec
List.
view
chro
in th
too r
(cf.
due

T
Spa
the
obe
disc
of t
dev
in v
doc
def
latt
eig
cov

the pose and composition of statues. P. 151: the statement of the changes in composing groups is useful and clear, though probably too rigid.

This is a disappointing work. Though Bieber's observation is keen, her text is often dogmatic and at times reads like a script for lectures with patter accompanying the less important slides. The illustrations are remarkably comprehensive, but though some are good, more are mediocre and a few are bad. In the descriptions the sizes are never, the restorations occasionally, given. The production of the book is excellent. *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* is not a reliable guide to its subject, but it is a valuable work for references.

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

R. M. COOK

LACONIAN STUDIES

W. DEN BOER: *Laconian Studies*. Pp. x+313. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1954. Cloth, fl. 17.50.

PROFESSOR DEN BOER's work contains a good deal more than the title would suggest. The first 150 pages (Part i) are devoted to various chronological issues, starting from the opening chapter of the *Life of Lycurgus*. 'I believe', says the author in his Preface, 'it is possible to demonstrate that already in the earliest phase of Greek historiography the struggle for the chronological pattern was carried on with great perseverance. . . . I have advanced the theory . . . that the struggle belongs to an earlier period [than the Hellenistic], that Aristotle had an important part in it, and that Plutarch follows him more closely than critics like E. Kessler realize.' Thus Den Boer introduces a long discussion on time reckoning by genealogies, lists of magistrates, and Olympiads. The problems are important and familiar; they have their place in relation to Sparta: especially the dating of King Theopompus and questions relating to the Ephor List. Less importance, one feels, need be accorded to the dating of Lycurgus in view of his very doubtful historicity. Yet however important these matters of chronology, they are here treated at too great length: the wood tends to be lost in the trees. There is too much quoting of other writers only to dismiss them; too many wider discussions only partially relevant to Sparta, such as the dating of Pheidon; on the other hand questions of moment are brought in incidentally (cf. p. 83 on Thucydides i. 18. 1). Much is left or made obscure: this may be due to the alien language in which the author is writing.

The second section of the book (Part ii) treats what is called 'an episode' in Sparta's constitutional history, based on *Lycurgus* 5-7. This section deals with the Great Rhetra, its Rider, the meaning of the term 'rhetra', the tribes and obes, and certain passages from Tyrtaeus generally regarded as relevant to a discussion of the Rhetra (Chapter i); the Ephorate (Chapter ii). The problem of the nature of the Rhetra against the background of Spartan constitutional development involves some severe difficulties: (a) the historicity of Lycurgus—in which Den Boer seems to believe: cf. p. 154 n. 1: ' . . . that the discus is a document which removes all doubt of Lycurgus' historicity and that it even defines his time with certainty, I fully endorse the former and I regard the latter as very probable'. He seems to opt for a date in the first quarter of the eighth century (154), but it is only with the greatest difficulty that one discovers this; (b) the nature of the reforms represented by the Rhetra. Here the

interpretation is largely determined by the date allotted to Lycurgus and the Rhetra, which puts them well before the crisis of the late eighth/early seventh century. They are therefore interpreted as 'a transition from the authority of the assembled fighting men to that of the Gerousia and Kings' (196), a recognized stage in constitutional development, and Den Boer is consistent in interpreting the Rhetra thus if it must be dated so early. The Rider he would keep separate from the Rhetra, as a 'later consolidation of the power of the Gerousia with the object of preventing the unproductive *ἀνταγορία* from causing a paralysis' (183). The Rider belongs to the 'crisis' of the First Messenian War under Kings Polydorus and Theopompus. There is a real problem here. Den Boer sees, with Hammond (*J.H.S.* lxx [1950], 42-64), that the presumption underlying the Rider is that in case of the non-co-operation of the Assembly the proposal of the unanimous Gerousia became law; otherwise the deadlock is not resolved. How did the Assembly come to accept this 'potential suicide'? It was asserted to be the will of the Gods, says Den Boer, following *Lycurgus* 6. 9, and this curtailment was accepted by a politically backward people in the war in which 'Sparta's very existence was in the balance'. It is certainly true, whatever the emendations and interpretations of terms in the Rhetra and Rider, that the Assembly suffered a severe limitation of its prerogatives, and if there is no *quid pro quo* some grave cause must be sought. But is there one in the late eighth century in the sense meant by Den Boer? The crisis surely comes in the late seventh century with or after the Second Messenian War—hardly as a result of the first war, which was one of aggression and conquest—unless we bring in the question of the development of the hoplite army and its effects, in which case we must surely ascribe the Rhetra, as well as the Rider, to the late eighth century or early seventh as a result of this 'crisis' apparent also in a number of other Greek states.

The prerogatives of which the Assembly is deprived are obscured by a corrupt text and difficulties of interpretation. In the last section of the Rhetra Den Boer would read δᾶμος ἀνταγορίαν ἤμεν καὶ κράτος, and translate ἀφίστασθαι (with Hammond) as 'adjourn'; he has a useful note (165) underlining the double status of the Gerontes as councillors and members of the Assembly. Den Boer accepts the emendation 'ἀνταγορία' with Wade-Gery (in *C.Q.* xxxvii [1943], 64) rather than the 'ἀγορά' of Hammond, but he would translate it as "contradiction" i.e. simply to "be in opposition", a vague early meaning (thus getting round the difficulty presented by Aristotle, *Pol.* ii. 3. 1273^a6, where the privilege ἀντειπεῖν (in the technical sense of 'make an amendment') is excluded in the case of Crete and Sparta). The difficulty arises with the Rider. If the term ἀνταγορία is correctly read, and means merely 'right of contradiction' not 'right of amendment' (Wade-Gery), how does Plutarch come to say that things went wrong τῶν πολλῶν ἀφαιρέσει καὶ προσθήσει τὰς γνώμας διαστρεφόντων καὶ παραβιαζομένων (6. 7)? Den Boer is forced to explain this by an 'increase in the self-confidence of the people' leading to an attempt at amendment of the proposals. The same difficulty arises with Hammond's ἀγορά. Another difficulty arises in the Rider with αἱ δὲ σκολιὰν ὁ δᾶμος ἔροιτο, which Den Boer would translate 'if the people are of the opinion that the proposal is not right . . .'. The present reviewer is not competent to give an opinion on language problems, but it is worth pointing out that if this is the meaning of the Rider it does not seem to take care of the problem arising from the 'attempt at the amendment of proposals' by the people,

which
mean
admit
ἀνταγο
Assem
have
propo
whole
with
taken
people
quo?
Den
Ephor
pomp
dema
amen
the E
probl
seriou
their
En
Gery
are in
the so
46-5
ὡβὰ
fused
La
Spart
of the
and i
capac
Th
Univer
RE
J. A
Pp.
brid
The
quity
them
num
the r

which the author seems to accept from Plutarch. *Either* we take ἀνταγορία to mean 'right of contradiction' and, accepting the suggestions of *Lycurgus* 6. 7, admit the normal translation 'if the damos formulates crookedly' or we take ἀνταγορία to mean 'right of amendment', accept Plutarch as meaning the Assembly overdid this, and again translate the Rider as above. Den Boer can have both 'right of contradiction' and 'if the people are of the opinion that the proposal is not right' only if Rhetra and Rider are combined as one logical whole and Plutarch's comment on the Assembly's action is ignored. Indeed with Wade-Gery's interpretations also the Rhetra and the Rider are better taken together. In either case there is a limitation of the prerogative of the people. Would such be accepted in the late eighth century without a *quid pro quo*? Here arises the question of the Ephorate in Chapter ii of this section. Den Boer in a confused account of the problems attached to the origins of the Ephorate seems to incline to its introduction by Theopompus (207-8): 'Theopompus' introduction of the ephorate does not imply his submission to the demands of the people, for that would have been inconsistent with his own amendment to the Rhetra which eliminated popular influence.' But may not the Ephorate have been the *quid pro quo* for this elimination? There is still the problem of the ephors' list and its commencing date, but the problem is less serious if the ephors came into prominence in the late eighth century than if their rise to power is placed in the late seventh or in the sixth century.

Enough has been said to show that Den Boer is no supporter of the Wade-Gery/Andrewes dating of the Eunomia. The latter term and its implications are insufficiently discussed in the book. The author makes a useful point against the so-called 'obal army', using A. J. Beattie's publication (*C.Q.* xlv [1951], 46-58) of a Laconian *lex sacra* which seems to mention a previously unknown ὠβὰ Ἀρκάλων, but the question of new citizens is treated in a vague and confused manner.

Lack of space prevents any but a brief reference to Part iii wherein 'Some Spartan Customs' (marriage ceremonies and fertility rites) and various aspects of the *agoge* are treated: a curious mixture, containing much both interesting and important. Again, as in the rest of the book, a sense of good order and a capacity to prune the unessential are lacking.

The book is well printed and produced and shows remarkably few misprints.

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN GREEK AND ROMAN HISTORY

J. A. O. LARSEN: *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*. Pp. vi + 249. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1955. Cloth, 30s. net.

THE topic covered by this book is of absorbing interest to historians of antiquity and it is surprising that it has hitherto received so little attention from them. This fact, joined to the reputation which the author has won by a number of previous studies in the same field, will arouse a lively anticipation in the minds of those who open the book that it will help them to solve one of the

most baffling problems in ancient political theory, the failure of the Greeks and Romans to make adequate use of the device of representation to solve the difficulties of government when for one reason or another the bounds of the city-state had been exceeded. These hopes will not on the whole be disappointed, though it would be vain to pretend that adapted lectures are the ideal form of presentation for the rich material which Professor Larsen has at his disposal. As a book his study would have been even more useful than it is if it had been possible to expand it to two volumes, the consideration of the *koina* of Asia Minor and of the western provincial assemblies being reserved for the second. As it is, the three chapters devoted to the period of the Roman Empire seem just a little cursory—the author admits as much in his Preface—and they rather fall between two stools. Considered as examples of representative government these assemblies are in a sense vestigial phenomena. Whatever their value to the government as a sounding board of public opinion, they really did very little *governing*.

However it is perhaps ungracious to complain that Professor Larsen has not given us a rather different book when that which he has given us is as full as it is of stimulating and scholarly discussion.

His first chapter states the problem admirably. He draws attention to the paradox that in the ancient world it was the doctrine of extreme democracy that was most hostile to the development of the representative principle, since it was fundamental to that doctrine that the judgement of the masses was superior to the judgement of experts. It became dogma that government must rest with a primary assembly, dogma ultimately accepted by political theorists in general, whatever their political alinement. Larsen here makes two important and connected points; first that the hardening of this dogma came comparatively late—not much earlier than the middle of the fifth century B.C.; second that 'even the fully developed Greek democracy contained so much representative machinery that little more than a shift in the emphasis on the various organs of government was needed to transform it into a representative government' (p. 4). For the latter point the evidence is mostly Athenian and principally concerns the *boule*. From epigraphic material partly already available, partly to be published in a work under preparation by Professors H. J. Carroll and Sterling Dow dealing exhaustively with the subject, it is clear that the Athenians maintained a system of representation in proportion to deme population for the *boule*, probably from the time of Cleisthenes down to about 200 B.C. There can be no question whether, but only how accurately, this system operated. The next problem is to decide what powers this body exercised. And here Larsen comes out strongly for the view that between the original reforms of Cleisthenes and the institution of the bouleutic oath (probably in 501/500 B.C.) the *boule* of 500 enjoyed very wide powers which were then curtailed by an enactment which formed the model for the much later decree preserved in *I.G.* i². 114. This view, plausible enough in itself, adds considerable point to Cleisthenes' elaboration of the composition of the tribe, since apart from army organization it was in the structure of the *boule* that the tribe would seem to have played its most significant part.

That the Athenians turned back after taking this firm step on the road to representative government seems clear. It is less clear why they did so and in this connexion there is a further paradox which Larsen might have touched on. When the practice of extreme democracy was at its height, at the end of the

fifth and the beginning of the fourth centuries, the Athenians were quite prepared to see a random selection of citizens, sitting as dicasts or *nomothetai*, perform functions which we should unhesitatingly describe as belonging to the sovereign power. This seems to me to weaken Larsen's argument that the primary assembly owed its continued ascendancy to the belief that the collective judgement of the masses was superior to that of experts. For neither *boule* nor dicasts nor *nomothetai* were experts. They were, quite simply, representatives of the *demos*.

Chapter ii turns to the consideration of some early instances of federation. It contains an acute analysis of the Boeotian Confederacy ('an out-and-out representative government' p. 35), the Thessalian (a more doubtful instance), and the Chalcidic, which Larsen thinks probably followed the pattern of the Boeotian. He suggests three reasons why this tendency towards representation in federal government was reversed in the course of the fourth century. (1) The democratic theory of the superiority of the primary assembly held the field at the time. (2) A primary assembly meeting in the capital city of a federal state helped the leading politicians of that city to control federal policy. (3) Some of the new organizations were created in opposition to Sparta and their founders would have been peculiarly susceptible to arguments in favour of the democratic primary assembly.

Chapter iii discusses representation in four Greek permanent alliances: the Peloponnesian League, the Delian League, the Second Athenian League, and the Hellenic League of Philip II of Macedon. Here the author picks up and enlarges on much of his earlier work and makes a number of general points of considerable interest about these alliances. On the specific issue of representation he concludes that it was only with the last of the four leagues that the principle of representation according to size or military strength was adopted and that this was no mere mechanical reform, but was designed to foster the impression that the assembly was not so much an assembly of representatives of separate states as a national assembly of Hellenes. Whether or not this is the correct motivation, it is at least certain that to abandon the system of one-city-one-vote in favour of representation according to size or power was the only realistic course and was a necessary prerequisite to assigning to the assembly any important function.

The two following chapters (iv and v) seem to me the most fruitful in the book. They deal with the Greek federal states from the beginning of the fourth to the middle of the second centuries B.C. They are concerned, as is natural, very largely with the Achaean Confederacy and their usefulness is much enhanced by an appendix giving a survey of all the recorded meetings of that Confederacy which Larsen has traced between 280 and 146 B.C. His treatment starts, as any treatment now must, from Aymard's masterly work on the Achaean assemblies. But he differs from him on important points. In particular he is surely right in maintaining that *boule* in Polybius must always bear its usual meaning of a smaller council as opposed to a primary assembly and that it cannot be used, as Aymard would have it, to cover on occasion a meeting of a primary assembly. In very brief terms Larsen's main conclusion on the Achaean Confederacy in these chapters is that down to about 217 B.C. it was governed by a *boule* with representation in proportion to population and an *ekklesia* in which votes were counted by heads: there were four regular meetings of the *ekklesia* every year and in addition extraordinary meetings; in fact the

model of the democratic city-state was being closely followed. A return to representative government proper was made probably in 217 B.C. Thereafter, though the Achaeans rendered lip-service to direct government by reserving questions of war and peace for extraordinary meetings of the primary assembly, these became the only meetings of that assembly. At one point his enthusiasm for his thesis leads him to a rather forced interpretation of a crucial passage. Polybius xxviii. 3. 7-10 has been thought by some to prove that Polybius can use *boule* and *ekklesia* of the same meeting. I find it difficult to accept Larsen's interpretation of the phrase οἱ δὲ περὶ Γάιον, συναθροίσεως τῆς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐκκλησίας, ἐλέγοντο μὲν βεβουλευέσθαι κ.τ.λ. He takes the genitive absolute as part of the clause subordinate to ἐλέγοντο so that 'the extraordinary meeting of the *ekklesia* neither was called nor took place, but was only part of the plans or thoughts attributed to the ambassadors in the gossip of the time' (p. 94). In general, however, his picture of federal government at this period is convincing and he does well to call attention to Polybius' criticism of the Macedonians that they were not used to δημοκρατική καὶ συνεδριακή πολιτεία as showing that for Polybius 'democratical and representative government', to adopt Thirlwall's translation of the phrase, was of the essence of civilized federal constitutions, which makes it the more strange and significant that, dominated as he was by the city-state concept, he gives us no theory of representative government as such.

The last three chapters deal with federal states and commonalties in the Hellenistic provinces, the provincial assemblies in the western provinces, and the transformed assemblies of the late Roman Empire respectively. Although they bring together much that will be very helpful for the student, there is less that is fresh here and the treatment would perhaps have gained by being prefaced with a more detailed study of the Roman constitution corresponding to the discussion in Chapters i and ii of the state constitutions of Greece out of which the federal states developed. Greek experience was at the disposal of the Romans at the time when representative institutions would have helped them to solve their governmental problems and it can hardly have been democratic orthodoxy which stood in the way of their adopting them. One reason why they did not may have been that the Senate had never become a probouleutic body; another that government for the Roman was always so closely bound up with the concept of magisterial *imperium*. But in any case the reasons for the Greek and for the Roman failure were surely substantially different and Larsen seems hardly to do justice to the difference. Even so we must be immensely grateful to him for providing a new jumping-off ground for study of a central problem in ancient history.¹

¹ If we must have notes at the end of the book, could not the publishers of the Sather lectures, to whom all scholars are much indebted, be persuaded that it is a real nuisance not to have the chapter number

printed at the head of each page? Without it reference to the notes, except when one is reading the book straight through, is needlessly complicated.

‘CIVILIZATION’ UNDER THE ROMAN EMPIRE

CHESTER G. STARR: *Civilization and the Caesars*. Pp. xiv+413; 25 plates. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press). Cloth, 52s. net.

HERE, from Augustus to Augustine, is a history of ‘civilization’, and ‘civilization’, whose definition Starr takes for granted, means ‘civilized thought’. The loudly trumpeted amenities of the Roman Empire—the *fora*, the porticoes, and the baths, for instance, for which Britain had Agricola to thank—are not ‘civilization’ in this sense. Nor are games and shows and horse-races. ‘Civilization’ is civilized man’s thinking about the fundamentals of social life and of human existence on this planet, his *Weltanschauung*. And that, these days, is a very civilized definition of civilization.

It is, however, an abstraction and it may be objected to Starr’s book that the subject is treated so much in abstraction that, except for certain general developments like the development of the *Princeps* into an absolute monarch, the broad historical background is kept too much out of sight. To which objection Starr could reasonably reply that there are other books in which the background can be studied, and that 150,000 words is long enough for a book anyhow.

In his introduction Starr writes: ‘The longer I have pondered the nature of history, the more clearly I have felt that the source of its enduring strength and appeal has been the fact that its generalizations arise out of concrete events which have definite location in time and space’, while on p. 283 he writes: ‘If human history is, as I take it, the expression of the capabilities of the human being, then the most vital forces of that history must be looked for in the psychological development of humanity.’ But the psychological development of humanity in any period of the past is very hard to track down in time and space, even if the period has been obliging enough to leave an abundance of relevant data. The trouble about the period from Augustus to Augustine is that it has not been so obliging.

In Augustan literature the optimism of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Starr holds, has no counterpart elsewhere. The preface of Livy is a depressing affair, no fanfare of trumpets to herald the entry of a new golden age. And Horace, as Starr thinks, suffered from profound *malaise*; he was ‘Virgil’s gloomy friend’. There follows the literature of Roman imperialism: pessimism, satire, mere wit, obsequious insincerity, ineffective Stoic philosophizing, a sort of *nostalgie de la boue* for the vanished days of freedom (how often does Plutarch refer to recent and contemporary affairs?). The excitement of being a modern historian vanishes; from Tacitus to Ammianus Marcellinus there is a great void.

Judged by material standards, the age of the Antonines may have been a golden age; but Starr sees in the thought of the second century only ‘a pompous, archaestic, intellectual sterility’ (pp. 203, 205, 275, etc.).

Here were the spiritual fruits of disillusion, spying, and censorship; and as he writes of this, Starr does not conceal the degree to which he sees in the early Roman Empire parallels to the horrors of much of twentieth-century life. Beyond making it clear that Marxist history has no attraction for him and

beyond noting the various fashionable explanations of the disintegration of the Roman Empire, Starr does not concern himself with the material causes of that disintegration. Freedom of thought in antiquity, he suggests, had never been complete freedom of thought, as we understand it; it had only been freedom of thought within the fenced enclosure of the existing political unit and the existing social order, and under the early Roman Empire that freedom was so restricted as hardly to deserve the name. In the second century 'the major factor was the isolation of the individual and his inability to support his isolated position'. But during the third and fourth centuries there came the first glimmerings of a new spiritual life, 'the emergence of the individual as an entity in himself, the turn of these individuals to a superior power and the equally important realization that man is bound to man in common humanity' (p. 301). 'During the third and fourth centuries man came to visualize himself as an individual entity' (p. 281).

It is Starr's belief that this was not simply the result of the Christian revelation centuries earlier, but that there was an independent development in paganism itself which readily fused in the fourth century with Christianity (our old friend, the *Zeitgeist*, in fact). For this he finds much evidence in the history of pagan architecture, contrasting the fixed boxlike form (with few internal decorations) of the classical Greek temple with the springing vaults, that lift both mind and eye, of the basilica of Constantine. He has much to say of the late-Roman architectural conception of space—'tri-dimensional space'. But this, of course, has its earlier pagan predecessors, in the Pantheon and also in the great hall of Domitian's palace on the Palatine (pp. 286–291; cf. pp. 286 and 297 for praise of the vitality of fourth-century art). He finds, too, in the contemporary reliefs on the arch of Constantine and in other works of sculpture a new vigour, however crude; a new emphasis on frontality, on the central figure in contrast to the massed crowd about it.

Here, then, was pagan architecture and sculpture breaking with classical tradition and developing, spiritually, in a novel direction. Moreover, the fact that the triumph of Christianity was not followed by widespread iconoclasm or by the burning and destruction of classical literature on a wanton scale shows, as does the half-heartedness of most of the Christian persecutions before that of Diocletian, that there was not an absolute, all-extensive rift between the advocates of the old ideas and the advocates of the new. 'The intellectual currents of the fourth century, either in art or in religion, cannot be plumbed unless one recognizes that it was an age of faith, among pagans as well as among Christians' (p. 332). Herein lies the overwhelming importance of St. Augustine himself in the whole history of civilization. What mattered for the future was that the victory of the Christian doctrine of faith over the classical self-sufficiency of human logic should be absolute. And in the failure of Plotinus and of Neoplatonism to establish an effective counter-attraction and in the defeat of Arianism, the victory was complete.

The writing of this book—even with a year's leave of absence from professional duties—was not to be enterprised lightheartedly and it is obvious that a great many years of hard reading and hard thinking lie behind it. It is an extremely stimulating book; let there be no doubt at all about that. You may put it away, but you cannot stop thinking about the problems that it raises. It covers one of the most significant periods of antiquity and one about which most of us are doomed to know only that we ought and would like to know far

more than we do. It is hard to know what is ideally the right amount of documentation for such a book. Starr has restricted himself to giving occasional references, mostly to passages in ancient authors which he has paraphrased or quoted (in translation) in his text. He might with advantage have given far more of these bare references, for there is no discernible reason why the reader should be given the opportunity of verifying one statement in the text and denied the opportunity of verifying others no less significant. There is a very general and necessarily somewhat eclectic modern bibliography, arranged under subjects, at the end of the book. It is enlivened by an occasional tart comment from the author, and it is the sort of bibliography which is likely to do more than stun the reader with the humiliation of his own ignorance; it is likely to send him to the libraries to read.

The photographs with which the book is illustrated, and which are extremely important for the development of Starr's theme, are well chosen and admirably reproduced.

Exeter College, Oxford

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

A SOURCE BOOK FOR AUGUSTUS AND TIBERIUS

VICTOR EHRENBERG and A. H. M. JONES: *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*, Second Edition. Pp. xii+171. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955. Cloth, 21s. net.

HERE, after a mere six years, is a bigger (by twelve pages), more expensive (by 8s. 6d.), and even better Ehrenberg and Jones. There is an 11 per cent. increase in the number of items, and a 68 per cent. increase in price. So that the book is a sad chapter in the economic history of the present, though it is a very glad chapter in the history of the publication of ancient source-material.

The first and most important duty of the reviewer is to thank the editors and the publisher for not renumbering the items. Ehrenberg-Jones 130, for instance, is Ehrenberg-Jones² 130; it is followed by a new item, 130a. Every new-comer is in its proper place and at the same time the numbering of the old items is not disturbed. There is only one exception. Ehrenberg-Jones 365 has become Ehrenberg-Jones² 94a—and rightly. It is the *tabula Hebana* which, in the first edition, was, like an item of stop-press news, squeezed in at the end of the book. Now it is in its right place, in the chapter concerning the Imperial Family; its text now takes account of new fragments and of the revisions of J. H. Oliver and R. E. A. Palmer in *A.J.P.* 1954, and it is followed by a new and most closely related item, the *rogatio* of A.D. ?23/24 in honour of Drusus.

The additions are of various sorts. Coins are given better representation, for just over half of the new items are numismatic. The opportunity is taken to print certain inscriptions already in Dessau which the editors were no doubt reluctant to omit from their first edition. But some of the most striking additions are inscriptions which have been published in the short interval since the first edition of Ehrenberg-Jones. A nice inscription of 21 January A.D. 31 from Lusitania (358a) gives us Tiberius and Sejanus as eponymous consuls (as does the coin 50a), the sinister L. Fulcinus Trio (*P.I.R.*², F 517) as legate and, for occasion, three Romans making 'hospitium' with Trio and being admitted into his *clientela*; this in perpetuity, as between the descendants of all the parties concerned. (Trio was to be suffect consul in this very year, from 1 July onwards,

and to perish four years later—but 'liberi ei superstites memorantur', as *P.I.R.*² observes; so the *clientela* may have had a little more than four years of effective life.) Then there are the new inscriptions from Roman Tripolitania published under the auspices of the British School at Rome, which provide 105a and 105b (the latter a bilingual inscription in Latin and Neopunic, erected by Annobal Imilchonis f. Tapapius Rufes) and 218a, which records the roadmaking for which Lepcis Magna had its patron C. Rubellius Blandus (*P.I.R.*, R 82) to thank. And, topping the bill for excitement, there are the two cuttings in a rock cave on the road from Canopus to Berenice in Egypt (360a and b) which are so nicely legible in the photograph which illustrates David Meredith's short article in *J.R.S.* 1953, 38 ff. 'C. Numidius Eros was here on his way back from India in March in the twenty-eighth year of Caesar' (2 B.C.), while 'Lysa, slave of P. Annius Plocamus' came on 5 July in year 35 of Caesar—viz. in A.D. 6. We know of Annius Plocamus and his farming of the Red Sea *vectigal* from Pliny, *N.H.* vi. 84.

The first edition of Ehrenberg-Jones won nothing but praise. As it has gone into a second edition, so it will go into others. The principle followed here of inserting and numbering new items must be followed. And if in each interval between editions there are as many new items of real interest to be added as there were on this occasion, a succession of historians, as they use the book, will have the opportunity of appreciating the debt which they owe to the numismatist, the epigraphist, and the archaeologist.

Apart from a few explanations of epigraphic abbreviations, the book, like its predecessor, has no notes of any kind.

Exeter College, Oxford

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

THE FACE OF TIBERIUS

LUIGI POLACCO: *Il volto di Tiberio*. Saggio di critica iconografica. Pp. xiii + 207; 43 plates. Rome: Bretschneider, 1955. Paper, L. 4,000.

TIBERIUS has, of course, had his place in general histories of Roman iconography and some of his busts and statues have been discussed in a number of recent studies of Julio-Claudian portraits. But this is the first time that a monograph has been devoted to representations of the second Princeps in works of art of all types. The writer claims to have established their chronology on the objective basis of dated or (in his view) datable monuments. He has brought some hitherto unfamiliar pieces into prominence; and as a collection of material his book is of undoubted usefulness.

Part i is concerned with sources—literary, numismatic, and epigraphical. The chapter on the coin-portraits does justice to the importance of this basic store of evidence; although Polacco asserts much too dogmatically that the die-engravers never worked from the life in the case of Tiberius. The sections dealing with the Emperor's actual appearance and with his attitude to portraiture are overloaded with redundant matter, which obscures the main issues and makes no original contribution.

Tiberius' 'youthful' portraits form the subject of Part ii. Of these an interesting and little-known piece is the togate statue from Cyrene, dated to A.D. 4 to 14 and here subjected to a detailed analysis. In the second chapter Polacco makes a wholly unconvincing attempt to deny the religious and processional

character of the contemporary scenes carved on the north and south precinct-walls of the *Ara Pacis Augustae*; and he also endeavours, with no more success, to discredit Moretti's identification as Tiberius of the figure next to Augustus, on the spectator's right, in the southern frieze, and to cast for the role of his hero one of the lictors to the left of the Emperor. The date of the Marlborough turquoise portraying Livia and Tiberius cannot be pinned down to A.D. 14 to 19, as Polacco thinks it can, on the score of Livia's hair-style; and his suggestion that the gem, now fragmentary, once showed Tiberius as Cupido-Iulus seated on the lap of Livia as Venus-Mater is not a little fanciful, although, in the circumstances, impossible to disprove. On the face of the altar erected in 2 B.C. by the *magistri vici Sandaliarii*—the subject of chapter iv—Polacco sees portraits of Livia (right), Augustus (centre), and Tiberius (left). The first identification is certain; and to the torc worn by Livia, Polacco attaches considerable significance. It is a symbol, he thinks, of female potency or motherhood; and the altar, carved at a time when Tiberius was still in exile and not yet adopted as Augustus' heir, mirrors her 'political resurrection' after Julia's fall and her hopes for the future of her son. That an altar publicly dedicated *Laribus Augustis* should express such a notion when Augustus still remained obstinately hostile to his stepson, seems unlikely. Nor is the figure on the left certainly Tiberius. It might be either Gaius or Lucius Caesar—or even Augustus, if the central figure be identified with one of the princes (the iconography is far from clear), and Livia's torc may be no more than a token of nobility. Part ii closes with a summary of Tiberius' physiognomic features, as his 'youthful' portraits have revealed them to us.

Part iii is concentrated on the great Vienna cameo, the *Gemma Augustea*. According to Polacco, the two figures on the left in the main scene are Tiberius dismounting from his chariot and Gaius Caesar, armed as *Princeps Iuventutis*, standing beside him; the cameo dates from 6 B.C., when Tiberius was still in Rhodes; it was executed in an east-Mediterranean workshop; and Tiberius sent it to Rome from Rhodes as a gift to Augustus for 'propagandist' purposes—to show himself as deferential to his sovereign and benignly disposed towards the youthful Gaius. But to present Augustus, whose distaste for his own cult in Rome and in the West was well known, with a portrait of himself in Jupiter's guise would have been, to say the least of it, tactless rather than conciliatory. Indeed, the presence both of Augustus-Jupiter on the Vienna cameo and of Tiberius-Jupiter on the great Paris cameo offers obstacles to the Augustan and Tiberian dating of the two gems respectively which have not, perhaps, been sufficiently appreciated. Augustus-Jupiter, like Tiberius-Jupiter (in this case shown in an unequivocally terrestrial zone, below the heavenly *Divus Augustus*), are certainly still on earth and not yet *divi*; and to depict living emperors as gods on 'Prunkstücke', obviously designed for appraisal in court and official circles, would hardly have been possible before the advent of Caligula's 'advanced' ideas on emperor-worship. Both cameos may well be 'accession-propaganda', both dating from the early months of Caligula's principate; and in that case the man and boy on the left on the Vienna piece could be Germanicus and Caligula himself. The marked stylistic divergences displayed by the two objects could be explained by supposing them to be the work of two very different hands working in two very different art-traditions. We need not assume that an interval of time must have elapsed between them: art of this type in the early imperial period was notoriously eclectic.

In Part iv Polacco reaches firmer ground in classifying and dating Tiberius' official portraits in the round—a medium in which it is much easier to discern the Emperor's distinctive features. These portraits fall into four successive groups, dating from his adoption by Augustus, from his first reception of *imperium maius*, from his reign, and from the generations that immediately followed upon his death. Most of his posthumous likenesses present Tiberius as young and idealized: only one seems to reflect the hostile tradition that was later to gain the ascendancy.

Appendix i deals with the famous carved cuirass of the Prima Porta statue of Augustus: there the warrior in the central scene is convincingly equated with Tiberius. The subject of Appendix ii is the relief-work on the bronze sheath of the 'Sword of Tiberius', found near Mainz and now in the British Museum. The seated Emperor in the principal picture is rightly, so the reviewer believes, identified as Tiberius receiving a Victory from Germanicus: the former's quasi-divine costume squares with the 'advanced' conception of the godhead of living rulers that is reflected in the utterances of Tiberius' adopted son, who probably ordered the sheath to be made as a gift for one of his subordinates. Appendixes iii and iv are respectively lists of presumed, but unauthenticated, and of false or wholly reworked, portraits of Tiberius.

Newnham College, Cambridge

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

TITUS

MARCELLO FORTINA: *L'Imperatore Tito*. Pp. 170. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1955. Paper, L. 900.

DR. FORTINA offers us a small but competent book on the 'beloved of mankind', following Titus through his youth, his service in Palestine (first as his father's subordinate and later as commander-in-chief), his participation in Vespasian's government and his own brief reign, down to his death in A.D. 81. Each chapter is carefully documented with notes at its end, of which some are quite extensive and deal with thorny old problems such as who gave orders to destroy the Temple and whether Agricola's governorship of Britain began in 77 or 78. Soundness of judgement and common sense rather than imaginative power characterize his approach to the period; as a corollary of this the style of the book is rather dull and flat.

The difficulty about Titus is that his reign matters so little. Apart from some measures taken shortly after his accession it is hard to find anything that can be called Titus's own policy; he faithfully followed the lines laid down in his father's reign. Now it may well be that the laying down of those lines was to a great extent Titus's work, and Fortina is right to devote a chapter to the period when he was *particeps imperii*; but it is not possible to be specific about this and say that such-and-such a development owed its beginning to Titus. Perhaps monographs on the shorter reigns are not really the best way of illuminating Roman history. For example, the story of the earlier years of Agricola's governorship in Britain is a bit absurd when isolated from the general conquest history and even from the last two years of his own campaigns (because they fall under Domitian).

Upon one imperial institution the career of Titus may have had a significant effect—the praetorian prefecture. The judicial powers of that office, of such

surprising importance in the early third century, are already apparent in the second, and the constitutional basis of those powers is still a subject of argument and cannot be gone into here. But what is their first appearance, as opposed to merely police functions and the custody of prisoners awaiting trial? Fortina, following Passerini, quotes Suet. *Div. Tit.* 6 and *Ep. de Caes.* 10. 4 as evidence that Titus, as praetorian prefect, had a criminal jurisdiction. These passages do not prove much, for they leave open the possibility that Titus's suppression of his enemies consisted in arresting them and bringing them before the courts on manufactured charges. There exists now, however, another tiny piece of evidence not used by Fortina, a papyrus fragment assigned to the 'Acts of the Pagan Martyrs', first published by C. H. Roberts in *J.R.S.* xxxix (1949), 79-80 and included by H. J. Musurillo in his volume on the 'Acts'. Here we appear to have some judicial proceedings in which 'Titus Caesar' plays a part. Both editors assume this to be a *cognitio* under Titus as Emperor, but there seems to be no reason why it should not be during the principate of Vespasian, and on this assumption Titus may be holding a *cognitio* either as praetorian prefect or—more probably—in virtue of his *imperium* as *collega imperii*. The 'Acts of the Pagan Martyrs' are largely fictional, and the fragment will bear yet other interpretations, such as that Titus is merely present at a *cognitio* of his father (cf. Suet. *Div. Tit.* 7. 1). Nevertheless it seems worth suggesting as a possibility that because Titus, in his unique position, did certain things as Caesar while he was also praetorian prefect, the prefecture came later to have attached to it powers which Titus had exercised in a different capacity.

Dr. Fortina's book was evidently finished too soon for him to make use of *P. Hibeh* 215, with its evidence that Ti. Iulius Alexander reached the praetorian prefecture; here are further implications (and conflicting possibilities) for the development of that office, as may be seen from E. G. Turner's paper in *J.R.S.* xlv (1954), 54 ff. H. St. J. Hart's paper, 'Judaea and Rome, the official commentary', in *Journ. Theol. Stud.*, n.s. iii (1952), 172 ff., was also perhaps not available to Fortina. In one or two other places he is rather less venially behind the times. Thus his knowledge of Agricola seems to rest on articles in Pauly-Wissowa and the earlier numbers of *J.R.S.*, and in discussing the relations of Domitian with his brother and father he ought to have made use of Frieze B of the reliefs from the Palazzo della Cancelleria; see, for example, H. M. Last in *J.R.S.* xxxviii (1948), 9 ff.

Disagreement is inevitable in places. I remain sceptical about the alleged conspiracy of Marcellus and Caecina, though Fortina makes a good case for the latter as a potential revolutionary. It seems surprising to find Suetonius described as 'interpreter of the point of view of the senatorial class' (p. 143). His career, as everyone knows and *Année Épigraphique*, 1953, no. 73 confirms, was purely equestrian, and the common view is preferable, that on the whole he does not share the senatorial prejudices of Tacitus. On the other hand he is guilty, as are all the sources, of a schematic and misleading contrast between the beloved Titus and the detested Domitian, and this, though Fortina recognizes it (p. 130, n. 42), he does not emphasize enough, especially in weighing the alleged plots of the younger brother against the elder. Titus failed badly in his duty to the Empire in not giving Domitian experience of government before he was called upon to exercise it.

One more point: Fortina (on p. 137, n. 99) seems to accept the strange view propounded recently by Instinsky about the meaning of *C.I.L.* vi. 944 (=

I.L.S. 264), a dedicatory inscription to Titus 'quod . . . urbem Hierusolymam omnibus ante se ducibus regibus gentibus aut frustra petitam aut omnino intemptatam delevit'. It is, I suppose, possible for the 'duces reges gentes' to mean merely the commanders, client kings, and client forces engaged in the Jewish war from 66 until the arrival of Vespasian and Titus early in 67, but it is hard to believe that anyone reading these words in 81 on a triumphal arch in the Campus Martius would have taken them so. The mind of the man in the street was not likely to leap to the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus, or even Pompey, and the darling of the human race may be pardoned his bit of bombast.

St. John's College, Cambridge

JOHN CROOK

THE REIGN OF GRATIAN

MARCELLO FORTINA: *L'Imperatore Graziano*. Pp. 308. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale, 1953. Stiff paper, L. 1,400.

THE study of the history of late antiquity, with its problems which become more contemporary each year, continues to grow, especially on the Continent. In the last few years we have had important books of a comprehensive nature, as well as studies of particular topics. Fortina has provided us with the life of a fourth-century Emperor, the first (apart from Constantine) to be so treated for some time.

There is a notorious difficulty in such biographies, which must be concerned with defining the relationship between the policies and personality of the Emperor and what was happening to the Empire. This is hard enough in the second century A.D. with the even tenor of its administrative and social changes. In the fourth century, however, there are added complexities. The nearer we get to the break up of the western Empire, the more difficult it is to avoid writing under its imminent shadow, as if all concerned were, or ought to have been, striving to avoid a foreseen catastrophe. Then there are the apparently irresistible economic and social pressures—the declining revenues, the increasing expenditure, the consolidation of the population into hereditary classes, and so on. The 192 constitutions recorded in xii. 1 of the Theodosian Code indicate the concern, and the inability, of the rulers to rivet fetters on the *decuriones*. In these, and other matters, the several Emperors appear to have no control over events. Yet there is the opinion of F. Lot: 'if ever there were supermen in human history, they are to be found in the Roman Emperors of the third and fourth centuries'. The great men of the later Empire were those who showed an untiring resistance to the forces making for its disintegration. No one could claim that Gratian was one of these. It is true that in some ways his youthful geniality affords some relief to the contemplation of the stern, the sinister, and the bigoted figures of other late Emperors; but he was a lightweight, and Fortina has not succumbed to the temptation to exaggerate the importance of his subject.

The well-known questions of Gratian's reign—such as the reasons for the choice of Theodosius in the crisis of 378, the influence of Ausonius and Ambrose on policy, the divisions of the prefectures—are adequately and cautiously dealt with. On these and other topics a few remarks may be made. It is doubtful whether Gratian's attempts to rectify administrative abuses had even the

limited success which the author attributes to them. The programme of public works was admittedly burdensome—and had probably been initiated by Valentinian. Much of the evidence of relative prosperity comes from Africa and apparently reflects only local conditions.

As Fortina says, within a short period after his accession, Gratian reversed his father's policy of hostility towards the senatorial aristocracy (whatever reasons Valentinian may have had for this). The better relationship established was creditable to Gratian, but there can be little doubt that it assisted the entrenchment of the aristocracy of the west in the quasi-feudal position which it had been winning at the expense of both the peasants and the imperial administration.

Fortina devotes his longest chapter to the religious question. Gratian's reign marked the definitive triumph of Christianity in the west; the struggle over the altar of victory was recognized by both sides as symbolic. Fortina considers that while it would be wrong to believe that Gratian was the tool of Ambrose, it was the determination of the latter that led to the establishment of Christian supremacy over paganism (which had certainly been stimulated by the reign of Julian, brief though that was). In effect, tool or not, Gratian, through his attention to an ecclesiastical adviser—as through his passion for hunting—represents in some ways the 'medieval' features which were becoming so marked in the later Empire, and which make it, like all periods of great changes, such a fascinating subject for study. It is a pity that this book, with its substantial merits, does not really enable the reader to feel the tensions and stresses of such a time.

University of Bristol

B. H. WARMINGTON

THE DECLINE OF ROME

SOLOMON KATZ: *The Decline of Rome and the Rise of Mediaeval Europe*. Pp. xii + 164; 2 maps. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Paper, 10s. net.

THIS book was written as part of an educational experiment. Students at Cornell, it appears, devote their first semester to the history of mankind 'from its origins to the eve of the French Revolution'. The theme of each week's study is presented in a book written specially for the purpose. Mr. Katz's account of the decline of Rome and the rise of medieval Europe is one of these books. 'Now that the classic languages, the Bible, the great historical novels, even most non-American history, have dropped out of the normal college preparatory program', explains the general editor, Mr. Edward W. Fox, 'it is imperative that a text in the history of European civilization be fully self-explanatory.' It must be self-contained, clear, and simplified, and it must 'assume almost no previous historical knowledge on the part of the reader'.

It is easy to raise an eyebrow; but let us be honest. The cultural background of this experiment is not peculiar to the United States. Educational conferences and articles on 'general education' *ad nauseam* merely underline what all teachers in civic universities (and probably in Oxford and Cambridge too) know already: the average student of today comes up to the university appallingly ignorant once he gets outside his own speciality. For this there are very good and sufficient reasons and this is not the place to analyse them. The

Cornell experiment—like the parallel Keele experiment in England—is an attempt to deal with this problem; and one can only applaud the purpose, even if one feels obliged to make reservations about the practicability of some of the details. The reviewer admits to doubts about the possibility of covering so much ground in so little time. Can students digest each week one such basic textbook, bought or borrowed, and even so much as dip into the excellent reading list provided on pp. 157–9? But perhaps this further reading is meant for a later stage in the student's university career, or for those other readers, the 'mature and literate audience . . . outside the college classroom', which is also envisaged on p. vi. There may be answers to these doubts; but in the meantime they persist.

Enough, however, of the programme. The reviewer's business is with the book. And here he can acclaim an excellent piece of popularization. The conditions laid down by the editors of the series have obviously helped Katz to produce a clear, well-written book which, in about 150 pages, sketches the crisis of the empire, its recovery and eventual collapse in the west, the ordeal and victory of Christianity, and the transition from the late empire to the early Middle Ages, and rounds the story off with a sensible assessment of the legacy of Rome. Also a separate chapter entitled 'Decline and Fall' is devoted to the central problem of the period, thus enabling even the elementary student to learn the vital lesson that history means inquiry.

The plan of the work is lucid and the balance good. Attempting to see it through the eyes of the Cornell student the reviewer notes a few places where compression seems to engender some slight obscurity or creates a false impression. Can one, for instance, really speak of the 'essentially amateur and civilian institutions of the senatorial republic' (p. 1)? Amateur, yes; but the existence of *imperium* as a concomitant of the leading magistracies seems hardly consistent with the word 'civilian'. On p. 7 a reader might be in danger of thinking that the word *limes* was used only of the fortified line between the Rhine and the Danube; from p. 82 he might reasonably assume that *latifundia* followed a straightforward line of expansion from the Gracchi onwards; and on p. 94 the statement that 'the emergency legislation of Diocletian and Constantine was made permanent as the crisis continued' might give a very misleading picture of the intention behind their reforms. On p. 49 in describing the tax in kind (*annona*) levied by Diocletian and Constantine as if it were something quite new, Katz appears to telescope a longer process. Van Berchem's view that the regular requisitioning of commodities and their free issue to the army and civil service go back to Septimius Severus has recently been queried by A. H. M. Jones in *Econ. Hist. Rev.* 1953, p. 298. But Katz concedes that the *annona militaris* is to be regarded as a development of the dark years of the third century, and not as a sudden innovation under Diocletian. The binding of the *colonus* to the soil probably belongs to the same period; for in Constantine's rescript of 30 October 332 this situation is clearly defined as already in existence.

In discussing why the western empire broke down, Katz adopts what looks like becoming the orthodox principle of multiple causation. He has a comprehensive discussion of the various factors stressed by different scholars, but it is perhaps inevitable in the circumstances that these do not always receive full justice. An example is the argument that 'an abundance of cheap slave labour prevented the invention and use of labour-saving machinery which might have

produced cheap products and thus stimulated the economy by extending the internal market'. It is no answer to this argument to point out that long before the fourth century slaves were neither cheap nor plentiful, and that there was in fact a labour shortage (p. 81); for the damage was done long before the fourth century inasmuch as an attitude of mind towards manual labour was by then ingrained among the upper classes of the Greek and Roman worlds, and any hypothetical modification of this attitude would have come too late. It is of course a fact that from the third century B.C. expansion of slavery went hand in hand with imperial expansion, so that a development of mechanical ingenuity was highly unlikely at the time when there would have been ample wealth available to exploit it. 'A more valid explanation of the failure to produce a machine technology', adds Katz, 'was the inability of the impoverished masses to purchase its products.' But surely this is an argument in a circle. No machine technology, ergo, impoverished masses; impoverished masses, ergo, no machine technology. But why were there impoverished masses? In the time of Gracchus clearly because slaves had driven free men off the land; and where rudimentary statistics are available, as in Hellenistic Greece, they show a similar economic competition, as Tarn pointed out long ago. The impoverishment of the free population was itself one of the fruits of the development of a slave economy. But in any case were there not poor men in the eighteenth century? Did this prevent ingenious mechanics with small capital developing cheap products and creating markets? Slavery may very well be only one of several causes of the decline of Rome. But it is a highly important cause, which can be shown to underlie many others that are often put forward as independent of it. Katz has done it less than justice.

However, this is merely one point, singled out largely because it interests the reviewer. It does not affect the verdict on the book as a whole, namely, that it is a workmanlike performance, admirably adapted to its purpose, scholarly and lucid, and well worth bringing to the notice of students in British universities. If the weekly *pabulum* maintains this quality, the series will deserve watching sympathetically.

University of Liverpool

F. W. WALBANK

A GUIDE FOR THE GERMAN TOURIST IN GREECE

ERNST KIRSTEN und WILHELM KRAIKER: *Griechenlandkunde. Ein Führer zu klassischen Stätten*. Pp. viii+472; 9 plates, 102 text figs. Heidelberg: Winter, 1955. Cloth, DM. 19.80.

ALTHOUGH the wrapper claims that every student and friend of antiquity will read this book with pleasure, it is doubtful whether it will be perused by many who are not actually engaged on a tour in Greece itself. To do the authors justice, they have designed the book above all for the tourist. Where they differ from their predecessors—*Baedekers Mittelmeer* and *Guide Bleu*—is in their attempt to present an up-to-date account of the results of modern excavation. The sub-title—'A Guide to Classical Cities'—does indeed describe the contents of the book more accurately. Nearly all the illustrations (which exceed a hundred in number) are ground plans of buildings, cities, fortresses, etc., and

the text is extremely full in its description of each site. The correlation between illustration and text is very well done by a system of numbers which are entered on both. Thus, if one enters the Argive Heraeum, one can start off with the words 'man betritt das Heiligtum von Süden her über eine antike Treppenanlage von 81 m Breite (Plan : 1), die zu einer Säulenhalle (2) und einer zweiten Treppe führt'. The plans and the description are most businesslike, and the two eminent scholars who have set their hands to this work have done it thoroughly.

In introducing each site or each place the authors give a section on history. They range from the Neolithic Age to the year 1953 with bold but inevitably concise strokes, and one is apt to feel that one is looking down the wrong end of a telescope. But the inclusion of medieval and modern Greek history is of value because the monasteries and the churches are given a good deal of attention. The sections on ancient history, including part of the first chapter which sets out to give a general picture, contain some strange theories. Thus the tourist is told that there is throughout Greek History a contrast between inland and maritime peoples and that in antiquity this was expressed in the contrast between Dorians and Ionians. To anyone who has in mind the history of Aegina, Megara, Corinth, Corcyra, Syracuse, Rhodes, and many other Dorian states, this generalization is really misleading. So, too, we have the old theory that Greece has always had a 'Kantönligeist' which, say the authors, was common to the Greek tribes on their first invasions, to the states of the Mycenaean period ('2 Jahrtausend vor Chr. '), to the states of Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman Greece, and so on until the present day in which it still has not disappeared. Such a generalization confuses the distinctions between tribal groups, Mycenaean kingdoms, proliferating Greek city-states (in Boeotia, for instance, where geographic division affords no explanation), Frankish dukedoms, and modern nationalism. If they were really alike, then one might be hypnotized into supposing them to have been the product of the Greek landscape where we read 'Gebirge und Meer trennen die Siedlungsflächen von einander und fördern die Entstehung landschaftlicher Sonderart und klein-staatlerischen Selbstgefühls (der altgriechischen polis)'. Nor should I have said that 'the unimportance of family life' was a mark of Greek culture through the ages and still less that any such unimportance was due to the long-lasting fine weather and to the open-air life which the Greek climate renders possible. The suggestion that the timing of the Battle of Marathon by Miltiades was no more than a 'Nervekrise' is unlikely to commend itself to a military historian.

However, the book is designed for the tourist and in particular the German tourist, for there is a certain amount of jingoism which grates on less sympathetic ears. It is a competent piece of work, efficiently executed, packed with information and cast in solid form and it has already gone into a second edition, with additional illustrations, a chapter on the Thracian coast, and a detachable map of Greece. But for most Englishmen it will be rather heavy reading.

Clifton College, Bristol

N. G. L. HAMMOND

JOHN OF SALISBURY

W. J. MILLOR and H. E. BUTLER: *The Letters of John of Salisbury*. Vol. i. *The Early Letters* (1153-1161). Pp. lxxiii + 296. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1955. Cloth, 50s. net.

THE first volume of this eagerly awaited edition of the letters of John of Salisbury cannot fail to fulfil the expectations of historians concerned with the twelfth century as well as of students of medieval Latin literature. When this critical edition is complete it will be a great relief not to be compelled to make use of Giles's text with all the uncertainties which this involved.

The present edition is based upon the text prepared, with a collation of all the manuscripts, by Dr. W. J. Millor, S.J., who also provided the substance of the notes. The translation is mainly due to the late Professor H. E. Butler; it has been revised and completed by Mr. C. N. L. Brooke, who has, in addition, dated and rearranged the order of the letters as far as is possible, though, as he explains, many of them are undatable and the dating of others is far from certain. The letters in this volume, described, for convenience, as the early letters, can be placed within the years 1153-61.

John was, as is well known, a prominent member of Archbishop Theobald's household, as afterwards in that of Thomas Becket. He was, indeed, Theobald's personal adviser and was responsible for the drafting of letters, official and otherwise, which here appear under the archbishop's name. About a third of the whole collection are written in John's own name and of these a third or so are of a more or less official character.

Readers of this periodical will probably be interested mostly in what has been called the humanism of John of Salisbury, the scholar with a well-stored memory, who, as Brooke reminds us, regarded the classics 'as a ware-house of examples', drawing, without much discrimination, on Macrobius, Martianus Capella, or Fulgentius as well as on Virgil and Lucan and, of course, Cicero and the Roman satirists. 'Excute', he once said, 'Virgilium aut Lucanum, et ibi cuiuscumque philosophiae professor sis, eiusdem inuenies condituram.' He was himself no systematic philosopher. He lived before the coming of the new Aristotle and he was critical of those whose heads were turned by the new Logic. His ideal was that of a practical wisdom, derived, in the first place, from the Scriptures, whose supremacy was unquestioned, but also from the ancients, whose works were a store-house of moral wisdom. We can guess that it was this side of Abelard's interests that appealed to him; for Abelard was a humanist who had delved into the Latin classics in a like manner. This is abundantly clear in his poem to his son Astrolabius, where there is the same mixture of moral precept and specifically Christian teaching. Lucan was a favourite in those times and John quotes him frequently, in his letters and elsewhere. For, along with Horace, Juvenal, and Persius, he appeared to his twelfth-century readers as a moralist from whom wise and useful precepts, of public as well as of private value, could be extracted. As Dr. Liebeschütz has reminded us, it was from the *Pharsalia* that John formed his mental picture of Rome in the first imperial century. He has also emphasized the influence on his thought of Cicero and Seneca. It is interesting to recall that Seneca left an equally profound impression on Roger Bacon. But these are random reflections, which afford no idea of the value and range of Brooke's introduction to John of

Salisbury's letters. It is enough to say that it is admirably written and deals with all the questions that interest the historian. The section on Theobald is especially valuable. The archbishop appears in his letters as a man of real ability, and of considerable tenacity in the face of constant difficulties, a faithful shepherd who worked always for the good of the English people and of the Church.

Brooke's Introduction is followed by an excellent account by Professor R. A. B. Mynors of the manuscripts of the collection of the earlier letters as well as of the printed editions.

Jesus College, Cambridge

F. J. E. RABY

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS

1. J. L. WHITELEY: *Vergil, Aeneid, Book V.* (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxvi+158; 9 plates. London: Macmillan, 1955. Cloth, 4s.
2. W. S. FOWLER: *Easy Selections from Vergil.* (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xvi+109; 21 plates, map. London: Macmillan, 1955. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
3. A. H. NASH-WILLIAMS: *Aeschylus—The Story of Orestes.* (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xxi+111; 6 plates, map. London: Macmillan, 1955. Cloth, 4s.

Past experience has shown that the quality of books in this series varies. No. 1 is a sound one. The notes are perhaps too full. There is a limit to the amount which a schoolboy will read, and a note to almost every line is probably too much. Such information as 'Phorbas is a name borrowed from the *Iliad*' might be denied with profit; and it is probably not worth giving alternative ways of taking a passage in a book of this type. The illustrations are adequate, except for a small, fuzzy landscape (of Mount Ida) of the type found in other volumes of this series.

No. 2—selections, in fact, from the *Aeneid* only—is not recommended. In contrast to No. 1, the notes are few: e.g. on *Aen.* vi. 854–92 there are no notes except on the Marcelli and on *spolia opima*, and no explanation of the word *opima*, which is not in the vocabulary. A spot-check on 88 lines from Book vi showed that the following words were not given in the vocabulary: *cupido*, *lentus*, *lucus*, *convallis*, *voluto*, *figo*, *peremptus*, *lividus*, *verro*, *generatus*, *fluenta*, *lumen* ('eye'), *propago*, *potens*, *alumnus*, *calcar*, *armus*. As for illustrations, it is surely a mistake to include illustrations drawn from ancient sources—wall-paintings, etc.—without giving the source (as is done in No. 1).

No. 3 presents a remarkable feat—the compression of the *Agamemnon* into 280 lines, and of the whole trilogy into 833. This attempt to bring 'one of the most attractive Greek legends, not to mention the only trilogy in Greek tragedy' to those who give up Greek before the Sixth Form, is laudable in its aim; but is it not better to reserve these plays for those who can at least make something of the choruses, than to present them in so truncated a version that they will get a hopelessly wrong impression? No indication is given of the substance of omitted passages. Would we apply the same treatment to *King Lear*? Within its limitations, the edition is well produced, but it is rather surprising to find

Verrall's naïve theory about the beacon-speech taken as proved, and no mention made of the conventional view.

4. E. D. C. LAKE and F. S. PORTER: *Aeneas Triumphant (Aeneid vii-xii)*. Second edition. Pp. xiii+169; map. London: Macmillan, 1955. Cloth, 4s.

5. G. C. LIGHTFOOT: *Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura, liber quintus*. Pp. xxii+74. Melbourne: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1953. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

No. 4, first published in 1936, compares very favourably with No. 2, and is excellent value for the very low price. It consists of a selection of some 2,500 lines from the last six books of the *Aeneid*, and aims 'not only at presenting the most interesting portions, but also at giving, in a fairly complete form, the story of the adventures of Aeneas and his companions after landing in Italy'. The vocabulary and notes are efficient. But there is a dreadful misquotation at the end of the Introduction:

All the charm of all the Muses

Often flowering in a single word.

Did this really survive undetected for seventeen years?

No. 5 is a selection of 611 lines out of 1,400, interspersed with a free translation of the omitted passages. There is a full and informative introduction, dealing with ancient philosophy, and Lucretius' life, poetry, language, syntax, and verse. It seems doubtful, however, whether teachers, at the level at which Lucretius is read, will be prepared to work from a curtailed text. I for one would rather make my own selection—which would not omit lines 1136-60. And the price is out of proportion to that of comparable texts in this country.

6. H. G. LORD: *A Structural Latin Course*, Book ii. Pp. 319; ill. London: University of London Press, 1952. Cloth, 9s.

This is the second part of a Latin course designed 'to explain, concurrently with the learning of Latin, the structure of language'. This is a good idea, at a time when Latin teachers are frequently heard complaining that their pupils do not understand the elements of English syntax. And the purpose is well executed, with clear diagrams. The passages of continuous Latin translation, which head each section, are excellent, being chosen to stimulate interest in ancient civilization; and they are backed up by good pictures, particularly those dealing with ancient architecture.

7. A. H. CHASE and H. PHILLIPS: *A New Greek Reader*. Pp. 140, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1954. Stiff paper, 40s. net.

8. HANS FÄRBER (ed.): *Griechisches Unterrichtswerk*. (i) HANS ZINSMEISTER: *Grammatik*, i Teil: *Laut- und Formenlehre*. Pp. 252. DM 6.80. (ii) ALFONS FRANK, ROBERT MENZEL: *Übungsbuch*, i Teil: *Formenlehre*. Pp. 240. DM. 5.80. (iii) ALFONS FRANK, ERICH FREUND: *Übungsbuch*, ii Teil: *Formenlehre d. Verbums*. Pp. 272. DM. 5.80. (iv) HANS BENGL,

RUDOLPH HOFMEISTER: *Übungsbuch*, iii Teil: *Syntax* (1. Hälfte). Pp. 120. DM. 4.80. (v) HANS BENGL: *Griechische Wortkunde*. Pp. 86. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag, 1954. Cloth and boards. DM. 3.80.

These volumes shed interesting light on the condition of Greek studies abroad.

No. 7 is an odd work to be circulated by one of our leading publishers at a time when one is told that it is no longer economic to produce Greek textbooks. The passages chosen—in prose only—are mainly historical, political, or philosophical in character. Apart from the obvious authors, there are excerpts from Aristotle, the Septuagint and the New Testament, Apollodorus, and Plutarch. There are notes and a vocabulary. The selection appears to be well done, but who is going to buy a book of selections weighing over two pounds, in typescript, not print, with paper covers, and costing forty shillings?

When No. 8 is complete, it will surely form the most sumptuous Greek course in print. The volumes are beautifully printed, and where there are illustrations, they are first-class. Clearly Greek studies in Germany are not a war casualty.

Queen Elizabeth's Grammar School,
Blackburn

B. H. KEMBALL-COOK

SHORT REVIEWS

AGOSTINO PERTUSI: *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*. (Pubb. dell' Univ. Catt. del S. Cuore, n.s. liii.) Pp. xxvii + 287 + 229. Milan: Società Editrice 'Vita e Pensiero', 1955. Paper, L. 6,000.

A TEXT of the Hesiodic scholia was printed in Thomas Gaisford's *Poetae Graeci Minores* (Oxford, 1820, vol. iii; Leipzig, 1823, vol. ii). The scholia to the *Works and Days* occupied some three-quarters of that volume and included the Byzantine commentators Tzetzes and Moschopoulos. The book under review gives only the *Scholia Vetera*, that is Proclus Diadochus and some unnamed annotators, but Pertusi hopes to continue with the Byzantines at a later date.

Of the ancient scholiasts on the *Works and Days* Proclus is by far the most considerable; and instead of repeating his name constantly, as Gaisford did, Pertusi marks his notes with an asterisk. The other and anonymous notes, which Gaisford, following the oldest Paris manuscript, marked *ΑΛΛΟΙ* and grouped under Proclus, are now separated. Many, too, are now printed for the first time, since they did not appear in the narrow selection of manuscripts used by Gaisford. Moreover, Gaisford's critical notes were neither full nor

accurate, and the chief merit of Pertusi's work is that it provides a widely based text with testimonia and critical notes. These, unfortunately, owing to the use of type-prints had to be separated from the text and are printed with separate page numbers at the end of the volume.

The manuscripts containing scholia to the *Works and Days* are very numerous but only one of the older and chief manuscripts of the poem contains scholia (Parisinus 2771 saec. xi ineuntis). But it represents only one half of the scholia tradition. Manuscripts of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries have much that is derived from a different source, though both sets go back ultimately to a single corpus of Hesiodic scholia much larger than now exists. Order was introduced into the mass of manuscript material by Hermann Schultz, then by M. R. Dimitrijevič, and more recently by Pertusi himself in contributions to *Aetnum*, 1950-2. Now in eighteen pages of prolegomena he gives a clearly written account of the manuscripts and their probable relationships. Future commentators on Hesiod will have reason to be grateful to Pertusi and his University, and will look forward to his next volume, hoping, however, for better printing.

T. A. SINCLAIR

Queen's University of Belfast

Homer's *Iliad*. Translated by S. O. ANDREW and M. J. OAKLEY. With an introduction by JOHN WARRINGTON. (Everyman's Library 453.) Pp. xiv + 370. London: Dent, 1955. Cloth, 6s. net.

If Homeric analysts should ever (*per impossibile*) seek a work in which they could put their skill in detecting the respective contributions of author and reviser to an objective test, they would find it here; in 1938 the late S. O. Andrew published, under the title *The Wrath of Achilles*, a translation, in an irregular four-stress metre devised by himself, of Books i, xi, and xvi-xxiv of the *Iliad*; he also roughed out, but never revised, a version of the remaining books (much of this was lost in the late war); and Mr. Oakley has revised what remains of Andrew's rough draft and completed it (his contribution includes the whole of Books iii, vi, xii, and xiv, and most of Book xv, together with shorter passages in the other books). Oakley says that he has done his best to keep the style and language uniform throughout, but there are noticeable divergences (e.g. in the translation of formulaary epithets: Andrew has 'round-cheeked' for *εὐκωπίδα*, Oakley 'bright-eyed' for *εὐκώπας*, and so on), and it should not be impossible for those who can detect the various layers in 'Homer' to dissect out Oakley from Andrew in the books where both have been at work. It would be interesting to hear Oakley's comments on the result.

Oakley has provided a 'Translator's Foreword', in which he explains the metre (the most interesting feature of the new translation), and discusses other relevant questions. In this, after a not unjustified (but at this date rather belated) attack on Pope for his inaccuracies, Oakley unfortunately sees fit to arraign certain other translators (not named, but described as 'men whose scholarship has been greater than their knowledge of English idiom') for the 'deadly ease' with which they write 'Translator's English'; and this compels the remark that Andrew and Oakley are by no means guiltless themselves: 'Translator's English' appears in many forms (violent distortions of word-order, archaisms, impossible constructions, and so on), and there are inaccuracies of which even Pope would have been ashamed (for example, Apollo twice appears as the son of Leda, and the Dioscuri are described by Helen as 'own brothers of mine, by the self-same mother begotten').

Mr. Warrington's introduction (pp. v-viii) contains several question-begging, and

even some entirely untrue, statements; and his bibliographies omit the editions by Leaf and Mazon, the Budé *Introduction à l'Illiade* (but perhaps Everyman does not read French), and Miss Lorimer's *Homer and the Monuments*, while including the following works which are no longer safe guides for the general reader: J. A. (not 'J.') Scott's *Unity of Homer*, T. W. Allen's *Homer: The Origins and Transmission*, and Sir J. Rennell (not 'S. R.') Rodd's *Homer's Ithaca*.

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

G. VAN N. VILJOEN: *Pindaros se tiende en elfde Olympiese odes*. Pp. 221. Leiden: Drukkerij 'Luctor et emergo' [1955]. Paper.

In one way, this Leiden dissertation is a curiosity; for if not absolutely the first treatise on Pindar to be written in Afrikaans, it is at all events the first I have seen or heard of. But this incidental peculiarity, which it is to be feared will reduce the number of its readers, is far from being the only distinction of the work. The author has reinforced his natural good taste and a hearty affection for the classics, for which he warmly thanks his teacher at Pretoria, with wide and critical reading in commentaries, books, and articles, the titles of which fill over five closely printed pages, besides occasional references in footnotes to works cited once or twice only. He has in effect produced a large-scale variorum commentary on *O.* 10 and 11, adding opinions of his own which show considerable powers of exegesis. It might indeed be held that the scale is too large (just over 200 pages, not counting a translation of the longer ode into Afrikaans, on 131 lines of admittedly difficult text). Space might have been saved, and the reader's task thereby lightened, by shortening, for instance, the several refutations of interpretations manifestly absurd. In my opinion, the views which Viljoen himself adopts, or, here and there, originates are never clearly false and generally almost certain to be right. When he indulges for a moment in suggestions for which in the nature of things no cogent proof can be given, he is not seldom attractive. He suggests, for instance (p. 9), that Pindar himself sang or at all events accompanied *O.* 11 at Olympia; he argues persuasively (p. 13) that the date of the composition of *O.* 10 was probably 474; he holds that the stream which rolls the pebbles away in *O.* 10, 9-10 is water conducted along an irrigation-channel, as in *Il.* xx. 257 ff. (p. 50, following a suggestion

of Norwood); he is of opinion (p. 122) that the story of the foundation of the games with its list of the first winners has as one reason for its presence the need to substitute something for what neither young Hagesidamos nor his family could provide, a catalogue of their earlier victories.

Among the many opinions which have been expressed concerning passages of really doubtful meaning, it is hardly possible that anyone should always choose the interpretations which appeal to any given reviewer, and therefore I forbear to set down a list of those places where I think Viljoen has voted for the wrong candidate. In one or two places where I like neither his interpretation nor that of anyone else whose work I have seen, I hope to expound my own particular heresies elsewhere.

Those who find the author's native tongue a serious obstacle may with profit use the excellent summary on pp. 206-10, which is in English of such quality as to suggest that he is that rare creature, a man genuinely bilingual. The printing has been well done, as it commonly is in the Netherlands.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

GERRIT JAN MARIE JOZEF TE RIELE: *Les Femmes chez Eschyle*. Observations sur quelques passages de ses tragédies où, de façon indirecte, les personnages féminins sont caractérisés comme tels. Pp. 87. Groningen: Wolters, 1955. Paper, fl. 4.90.

THE purpose of this doctoral dissertation is not so much to define the characters of Aeschylus' women, though this is incidentally involved, as to show that Aeschylus had a clearly defined notion of female as opposed to male characteristics. It would indeed be strange if he had not. The panic-stricken Chorus of the *Septem* is evidence, if we need it, that A. 'a bien observé une émotivité plus grande chez la femme'. When we come to less unmistakable traits we encounter the problem which besets all studies of character in ancient drama. If we assume in the Attic poet and his audience the same sort of awareness of points of characterization as can be assumed in a modern audience, then an acute reader can detect many details which are significant for an appreciation of the plays; but they are not such as demand attention, and if the initial assumption is

wrong, concentration on such details tends to distort the picture.

M. te Riele is not among those who are disposed to doubt the essential identity of the ancient consciousness with our own, and one need not be a disciple of Howald to suspect that he often brings down his hammer on an absent nail. Did those who attended the first performance of the *Persae* really justify to themselves Atossa's eleventh-hour request for information about Athens by reflecting that it was like a woman to be curious? Are we really entitled to draw from the 'solidarité' displayed by the Oceanides conclusions about the status of women in Athens, or from the behaviour of the Erinyes any conclusions at all? Nor does the author always avoid the suspicion that he is treating dramatic dialogue as though it were a *procès-verbal*.

None the less this is a lucid and business-like piece of work. Some of the suggestions are of considerable subtlety, and there are interesting comments on the dialogue of Clytaemnestra with Agamemnon in *Ag.* and with Orestes in *Choe*. As the final chapter shows, the author is fully conscious of the confusion which besets most discussions of this subject and of the need for a satisfactory terminology. He probably has it in him to do something to improve the situation himself.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

Euripides: Four Tragedies. *Alcestis*, translated by RICHMOND LATTIMORE, *Medea* by REX WARNER, *Heracleidae* by RALPH GLADSTONE, *Hippolytus* by DAVID GRENE. Pp. ix+221. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1955. Cloth, 28s. net.

THIS third volume of the Chicago *Complete Greek Tragedies*, like its predecessors containing the *Orestia* and Sophocles' Theban plays, is an interesting collection of examples of the bald, prosaic type of verse translation practised with considerable success by Mr. Rex Warner—a style in which it is often difficult to see why the dialogue, at any rate, has not been set out as prose. Whether this style is satisfactory, or even readable, is a matter of taste. At its best it rarely brings out the poetic quality of the original, and it is always in danger, especially in chorus and stichomythia, of falling painfully flat. But it is at

least more appropriate to Euripides than to Aeschylus or Sophocles.

Wardner's *Medea*, first published in 1944 and reprinted here, shows the surest touch and the greatest strength, but it is unfortunate that some gross errors are still uncorrected. Πηλιώτιν (484) has nothing to do with Peliás, and παραδοκῶ τάκειθεν οἱ προβήσεται (1117) does not mean 'I stare toward the place from where the news has come.' Nor is Jason's ἀπώλεσα (1350) 'my life is over'.

Of the three new versions, Professor Grene's *Hippolytus* seems the most successful, and should convey to the reader much of the sustained beauty and power of the original. Professor Lattimore's *Alekestis* lapses too often into clumsiness ('The sun sees you and me, two people suffering, who never hurt the gods so they should make you die.'). Sometimes into banality (*Admetus*: 'The dead are dead. Go on in.'). Elsewhere, as if in an effort to avoid dullness, an unusual and obscure phrase is used, quite unjustified by the Greek: thus μελάθρων στέγαι (248) becomes 'palace arching my land'. This last tendency to 'brighten up' the original is carried to remarkable lengths by Mr. Ralph Gladstone in his racy version of the *Heracleidae*. Some scenes of this strange play may well be semi-comic in intention, but that hardly justifies the use of slick comic language throughout, turning αὐτὸς δέόμενος σωτηρίας (11) into 'I could use a guard myself', or ἡμᾶς ἤθελ' Εὐρύσθευς κτανεῖν (13) into 'Eurystheus decided to eliminate us, too', or δοῦνι γερόντοι διδ στραγγεῖται φύγι (39) into 'a trip conceived and planned by two old strategists'. Even the diction of the chorus is all too thoroughly up-to-date:

We're peaceful men, but in advance
We warn a king who's gone berserk
To keep away. He'll have no chance
To carry out his dirty work. (371-5)

Gladstone's topical clichés make lively reading and their smartness may attract the reader in 1955; but one wonders how they will sound ten years hence. In any event, this is not Euripides.

Professor Lattimore contributes a general introduction to the volume, and each play is preceded by prefatory pages, which deal mainly with the poet's use of the legend. They contain some dubious statements and reasoning, of which Gladstone's arguments on the date of the *Heracleidae* are the most improbable. Sthenoboea is misspelt three times on p. 158.

H. C. BALDRY

University of Southampton

HANS DILLER: *Die Bakchen und ihre Stellung im Spätwerk des Euripides*. (Abh. der Akad. der Wiss. und der Lit. in Mainz, 1955, 5.) Pp. 21. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1955. Paper, DM. 1.80.

WITHIN the short space of this paper Dr. Diller contrives to give an interesting and surprisingly full account of the cult of Dionysus as presented in the *Bacchae* and of the play as a whole. After a brief survey of earlier interpretations he concludes that through the work of contemporary scholars more satisfactory lines of approach to the play have now been laid down. His own exposition is based largely on their work, and to three of them in particular, Wassermann, Dodds, and Winnington-Ingram, he makes full and frequent acknowledgement. He differs, of course, from one or other of these scholars on certain points, and the whole discussion is well reasoned and freshly presented; but the general approach to the play is on lines now fairly familiar. In the last part of his paper, however, after drawing attention to important differences between the *Bacchae* and the *Hippolytus*, with which the *Bacchae* has often been compared, he maintains that a more fruitful comparison is between the *Bacchae* and other plays of the same decade, particularly the *Ion* (to which he assigns a late date) and the *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Here his arguments do not seem to me to be very convincing and the structural resemblances which he finds seem rather superficial. Thus he observes that as Pentheus is first the hunter and then the hunted, so Creusa is first 'Verfolgerin' (when she plots the murder of Ion) and then 'Verfolgten' (when he pursues her at the head of a crowd of Delphians). But in the *Bacchae* the gradual reversal of the relative positions of Pentheus and Dionysus as they appear at the beginning is a leading motif, constantly emphasized with great variety of detail, and indeed in a sense it is the plot of the play, whereas in the *Ion* the 'reversal' is no more than the natural reaction of the victim of an attempted murder, and the murder plot itself is an exciting incident in the play but not a vital part, since the essential denouement could have been otherwise achieved. Again Diller compares the situation in these two plays where in the *Bacchae* the mother at the head of her fellow bacchantes is about to slay her son, and in the *Ion* the son at the head of his supporters is about to slay his mother. As he observes, the roles are reversed and in the *Ion* all ends happily, and these are not

unimportant differences. But in any case the question is whether such similarities of situation or structure have much significance in view of the fundamental differences between the *Bacchae* and the other two plays. Diller is naturally aware of these differences: he recognizes, for instance, that the *Ion* is not a tragedy and describes it as 'das untragische Gegenstück zu den Bakchen'; he stresses, too, the role of *τύχη* in the *Ion* and the *Iphigenia*, and it is not accidental that the *Bacchae* is the only play of Euripides in which the word *τύχη* never occurs. But this being so, the *Bacchae* seems to me to be such an entirely different kind of play from the *Ion* and the *Iphigenia*, that I doubt whether comparison with them is really at all valuable.

P. T. STEVENS

Bedford College, London

ANTONIO GARZYA: Euripide, *Ecuba*. ('Traditio': Nuova Collezione di Classici Greci e Latini.) Pp. 140. Rome: Società Dante Alighieri, 1955. Paper, L. 450.

THIS little school edition is full of matter and good value for money. The Greek text, based on Murray's, is followed at the bottom of the page by two commentaries typographically distinguished, the one mainly grammatical, the other literary and antiquarian. Attention is well directed to passages where Euripides was writing with his own rather than the heroic age in mind. The Introduction of 24 pages rather surprisingly includes the complete ancient Life of Euripides in text and translation. The account of the play is judicious, but the editor is not justified in suggesting that previous critics have failed to bring out the contrast between the gracious end of Polyxena and the ugliness of Polydorus' murder; it is certainly noticed by Pohlenz. Nor is it obviously true that the play has no *peripeteia*. It is doubtful whether a brief appendix on lyric metre can be of much use to those for whom this edition is intended.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

P. J. G. M. VAN LITSBURG: *God en het goddelijke in de dialogen van Plato*. Pp. 224. Nijmegen: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1955. Paper.

THE author first collects, paraphrases, and discusses the most important passages of Plato relevant to this subject, beginning with

Rep. ii. and ending with *Epinomis*. In the light of this—the main—section of his work he proceeds to review the contributions of some twenty-seven exponents of Plato's theology, from Zeller to Professor de Vogel, whose criticism of Diès's view of *τὸ παντελὸς ὄν* (*Soph.* 249 a: 'la somme totale de l'être', accepted by Cornford and Ross) deserves to be better known. A brief final chapter recapitulates the difficulties which militate against any clear-cut solution. A twelve-page English summary adds to the usefulness of the book.

van Litsenburg's treatment of the texts is candid, competent, and well informed, and he gives painstaking and sympathetic accounts of modern interpretations. His criterion is faithfulness to 'what Plato says'; and from this point of view, curiously enough (but, I think, justly), Shorey seems to tie with Solmsen for the lowest marks, while Diès, in spite of brevity and a tendency to outrun the evidence, receives the most commendation. Many confident arguments of modern commentators, deflated by the author's sober and unpretentious version of them, are seen to be extraordinarily flabby. Among these may be mentioned the contention that *Rep.* 597 b is not seriously meant, or the too facile evasion that there is a fundamental disharmony between Plato's metaphysics and his religious beliefs, or the considerations offered against identifying Plato's God with the idea of good. Here van Litsenburg repeatedly stresses that Plato does not explicitly make this identification himself; and, similarly, though he would like *τὸ παντελὸς ὄν* to refer to the 'absolute being' of God, he is at pains to make it clear that the context is concerned with logic and ontology rather than theology. On the other hand, having collected from the dialogues the attributes of Plato's Deity, he is fairly sure that neither the World-Soul nor the Demiurge, both of which really are called 'god' by Plato, represents the full Platonic concept of the divine: each is a partial, but not misleading, representation of the Deity. He is disposed to identify the Demiurge with his Model; but since this is a deduction from the text and not a statement by Plato in so many words, he pronounces the identity not proven. Thus although his sympathies, and the evidence which he deploys, appear to favour those who take a synthetic view (e.g. Jaeger, Hoffmann), his perhaps exaggerated respect for literalistic interpretation prevents him from going much of the way with them. In other words, he has not really faced the question whether behind the dialogues there was a coherent view or series of views, to which the commentator should provide a key by fitting together, without undue violence,

those portions of the puzzle which Plato has placed before us. There is, however, only one variety of constructive interpretation which he decisively rejects—that which proceeds on neoplatonic lines (Robin, Hardie, de Vogel). One important point is not explicitly brought out: the differing views of the moderns on the meaning of 'god'. Some, for example, think that a personal god must necessarily be anthropomorphic, though personality involves only soul and intellect, as Robin observed, and there is no objection to describing it in 'symbolic and mythical terms'.

When quoting *Symp.* 211 c the author (p. 23) notes that he is using Robin's text. I wonder if this means that he found the current Oxford text untranslatable, as indeed it is: Burnet in the second edition rejected the final *ὡς* (Schanz) of his first edition (c 6), adopted Usener's *τελευτήσουσι*, but omitted to replace *καί* by Usener's *ἵνα* before *γνῶ* (c 8).

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

Plato: *The Republic*. Translated by H. D. P. LEE. 405 pp.; 2 figs. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1955. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

MR. LEE has made a worthy addition to the long and distinguished list of English translations of the *Republic*. His method (discussed pp. 48-49) approaches most nearly to that of Cornford, to whom he owes many turns of phrase. There are, however, two main differences, both due to Lee's insistence on reproducing above all else the sense of living talk in the dialogue. On the one hand, he does not, as Cornford did, shorten passages by leaving out the responses of Glaucon or Adimantus; on the other, he is a good deal freer than Cornford in his admission of phrases of a distinctively modern colloquial character. Some of these last are very good: for example, 'milling around' for *περικυκλῶνται* at 488 c. About others one may feel uncertain: we do not really know whether *τῷ τῶν Δία* at 452 b was much like 'Gosh!'. The version achieves much more speed and liveliness than its predecessors, but less grandeur than Jowett or Cornford; and, although Lee's renderings of the myth of Er and other more magnificent passages are not inadequate or flat, they are not particularly impressive either. The choice of words for rendering common moral or abstract terms in various contexts is always thoughtful and always commands respect: there is little to criticize here, except perhaps the use of

'discipline' for the cardinal virtue *σωφροσύνη*, which seems obscure and not very close.

The long introduction deals well with Plato's life and with the political background to the book, but not very much is said about philosophical problems. There is some stimulating criticism of Plato's views on art, and a few remarks on what modern writers have said and modern readers are likely to think about his ruthlessness and his over-confidence in education and in his ideal rulers. Some of the replies to Popper's views—e.g. the books by Levinson and Wild—might have been mentioned here.

There are good summaries of the argument, and generous notes, which are most useful and interesting: the appendix on the Spindle of Necessity should be noted by scholars. Lee diverges from Burnet's text fairly often (and notes the fact when he does) and in difficult passages usually follows Adam (e.g. in the 'number', despite Diels).

The book is well produced, and deserves to prove one of the most popular items in the amazingly popular Penguin Classics.

D. A. RUSSELL

St. John's College, Oxford

CORA MASON: *Socrates, the man who dared to ask*. Pp. x+165; 4 drawings. London: Bell, 1955. Cloth, 9s. 6d. net.

THIS small book, which was first published in America in 1953, is an imaginative presentation of the life of Socrates. It is based on an intimate knowledge of the ancient authorities but is apparently intended in the first instance for those who have not themselves read Plato. It is extremely successful. Partly by the use of dramatic form—the first chapter is put in the mouth of Crito and others are virtually dialogues—but much more through the simplicity and excellence of the writing we have a series of pictures which live and breathe. The temptation to preach a sermon to the modern world has been firmly resisted and the result is a sensitive narrative which it is a pleasure to read.

We do not know how Socrates first came to philosophy. The guess in the present book is that he began with the search for beauty and an attempt to understand its true nature. It is suggested that it was Socrates' own ugliness and the reactions of other people thereto which was the cause. Less plausible is the implied view that almost from the start Socrates regarded this as a search for some

kind of deeper reality or even a supra-sensible world. Next came the impact of the trial of Anaxagoras after the decree of Diopiteus, and his withdrawal from Athens. Socrates plunged eagerly into the study of natural science. After 'years of study' (p. 69) he listened to a reading of Anaxagoras' book and then read it for himself. The book had been written by Anaxagoras apparently just before. There followed the philosophic revolution which Socrates describes in the *Phaedo*, the visit to the oracle by Chaerephon, and the definite decision to abandon stone-cutting in favour of the search for the truth. There are chronological problems here which are concealed by the excellence of the writing. If Anaxagoras left Athens about the time of the beginning of the Peloponnesian war and died in 428 B.C., which is the orthodox view, then the time-table is overcrowded. And it is in any case not very likely that the book of Anaxagoras was written quite so late in his life. The answer may be that Anaxagoras left Athens long before the Peloponnesian war and in that case the picture of Socrates presented could be right. But the evidence of the *Clouds*, which is virtually ignored in the present book, might bring the conversion of the *Phaedo*, if historical for Socrates, to later than 423 B.C.

G. B. KERFERD

University College of Swansea

ROGER GODEL: *Socrate et Diotime*. Pp. 62. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper.

THIS essay represents a not unpleasing exercise in imaginative reconstruction. Though it employs some of the apparatus of scholarship, it should not be regarded as a serious contribution to learning. We are asked to hold that the true Socrates was neither a builder of systems nor a genial logician searching for an effective dialectic, but a sage seeking a way of passing from the contradictory world of the senses to a higher reality. The method is variously spoken of as maieutic, as anamnesis, and as submitting to the guidance of Nous, but the differences, if any, are not discussed and we are left with an undefined mystical approach to supreme reality. In this respect Socrates does not differ from the sage in Indian thought, a theme previously developed by Godel in *Socrate et le sage indien*, Paris, 1953. Socrates was initiated into the true way by Diotime, who was an historical personage, a priestess of Mantinea, and one of a long succession of women philosophers absorbed in the inner life who devoted

themselves to the search for mystical wisdom. It may even be that Herodotus is right in tracing the succession back to the Egyptians (ii. 171). Diotime came to Athens by way of Argos in 440 B.C. and made her revelation to Socrates, as we see in the *Symposium*. The conversation took place in the setting of the *Phaedrus* and its imagery was influenced by 'le paysage spirituel de la haute plaine mantinique'. Some of the sites visited by Diotime on the Mantinean plain are discussed together with their nymphs.

The historical existence of Diotime, though usually rejected, has been defended, for example, by A. E. Taylor, and might conceivably be true. But not many will be persuaded of the existence of a school of philosophic women at Mantinea, and it seems inconceivable that this should be the real source of the doctrines attributed to Diotime in the *Symposium*.

G. B. KERFERD

University College of Swansea

Histoire de la Philosophie et Métaphysique, Aristote, Saint Augustin, Saint Thomas, Hegel. (Recherches de Philosophie, i.) Pp. 253. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1955. Paper, 150 B.fr.

THIS is the first volume of a new series of studies and articles to be published once a year under the direction of l'Association des Professeurs de Philosophie des Facultés Catholiques de France. The series is in succession to the *Revue de Philosophie* founded in 1900 and is designed to continue the work of that periodical under a new form. A second volume is to be concerned with La Dialectique and a third with Science et Philosophie.

The contents of the present volume are as follows: (1) D. Dubarle, 'La causalité dans la philosophie d'Aristote'; (2) C. Couturier, 'Structure métaphysique de l'être créé d'après saint Augustin'; (3) G. Ducoin, 'Saint Thomas, commentateur d'Aristote'; (4) R. Verneaux, 'L'essence du scepticisme selon Hegel'; (5) A. Sesmat, 'Perfectibilité de la logique formelle classique'; (6) J. Pépin, 'Chronique: Histoire des philosophies anciennes'. As the titles indicate, only 1, 3, and 6 are likely to be of direct concern to classical students. Of these the first is a fairly extensive discussion of a general character, which attempts to arrive at a theory of causation, or perhaps better of explanation by what is described as a method of abstraction

from what Aristotle says. It should be of considerable interest to those who approach the problem from Aristotelian premisses. No. 3 is rather more technical and provides an interesting discussion of Saint Thomas's method of treating Aristotle, *Met. A* 7. 1072^b28 ff. and 1072^b18-19. It shows how his conception of the function of a commentator differed from that usual at the present day. No. 6 digests and criticizes a number of books from recent years in the form of a survey covering work on all periods of Greek philosophy. It is chiefly remarkable for its extremely selective character. Though it is by no means confined to works in the French language, it virtually ignores all works published in English.

G. B. KERFERD

University College of Swansea

Aristoteles Latinus. Codices descripsit G. LACOMBE; in societatem operis adsumptis A. BIRKENMAJER, M. DULONG, A. FRANCESCHINI. Supplementis indicibusque instruxit L. MINIO-PALUELLO. Pars Posterior. Pp. 771-1388. Cambridge University Press, 1955. Cloth, 84s. net.

VOL. I of this work, by the late Georges Lacombe, was published at Rome in 1939. The plan was for a detailed catalogue of all manuscripts of medieval Latin translations of Aristotle or of Greek commentators on him, to be completed in two volumes which should introduce the complete series of the *Aristoteles Latinus* (of which some fascicles have already appeared). In consequence of Dr. Lacombe's death, vol. II has been brought out by Dr. Minio-Paluello. The scheme was that manuscripts should be grouped according to the country in which they were to be found (the boundaries of 1939 being followed), countries being arranged according to the alphabetical order of their Latin names; as a result vol. II contains manuscripts in Switzerland, Spain, Hungary, Italy, Yugoslavia, Portugal, Poland, Russia, Sweden, and the Vatican City (Italy, including the Vatican City, supplying about two-thirds), together with a supplement containing omissions from both volumes (including one manuscript in Auckland). These bring the number of manuscripts to 1937, but Dr. Minio-Paluello adds a list (compiled by Mr. N. R. Ker) of fragments to be found preserved in the bindings of printed books or manuscripts in British libraries; these form *codices* 1938-2012.

The description of the manuscripts has been executed in great detail. There are supplements to the bibliography and to the pages of *specimina* in vol. I, and the volume closes with three indexes which together occupy over 100 pages—one of proper names and the titles of works, one of the opening words of works, and one of manuscripts mentioned in the prefatory matter and the notes.

Dr. Minio-Paluello deserves to be thanked and congratulated on bringing this enormous work to completion.

D. A. REES

Jesus College, Oxford

ROLF WESTMAN: Plutarch gegen Kolotes. Seine Schrift *Adversus Colotem* als philosophiegeschichtliche Quelle. (Acta Philosophica Fennica, fasc. vii.) Pp. 332. Helsinki: Filosofinen Yhdistys, 1955. Paper.

FOR the understanding of Plutarch himself, *adversus Colotem* is of no great importance. It is true that it is one of the very few works to which a date (99) can be assigned with a good chance of being right. It is interesting too to reflect that, with all his Platonic learning, Plutarch thought it worth while to refute the three hundred and fifty year-old treatise of Colotes *περί τοῦ ὅτι κατὰ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων δόγματα οὐδὲ ζῆν ἔστιν*, while apparently remaining in ignorance of the same writer's far more annoying polemics against the *Lysis*, the *Euthydemus*, and the myth of Er. But it is as a source-book both for the early philosophers and for the Epicureans that the treatise is really of value. Its study from this point of view has now been very greatly facilitated by Westman's admirably accurate, methodical, and fair-minded dissection. He makes it possible to see at a glance just what information we owe to *adv. Col.*, and he has discussed practically every relevant difficulty with minute patience and wide and thorough knowledge of the literature. He first shows that Colotes' work was entirely critical, containing no positive Epicurean doctrine, and that Plutarch's way with it is to show point by point—though not in Colotes' order—that the Epicureans can very often be assailed by the arguments they have themselves used against others. He then (chaps. 4-5) reviews at great length both the Epicurean and the non-Epicurean material in the book. Here, both Epicurean and pre-Socratic specialists will find much of interest (Westman's notes on Empedocles B8-11 may be singled out for mention.) New

interpretations are naturally few, but I should like to draw attention to two or three useful contributions. P. 125: at 1119 D, E, editors have always been content with τὸν θεὸν μὴ λέγειν θεόν: Westman convincingly points out that this is not sense in the context, and that an adjective is needed—he suggests ἀγαθόν, but I am not sure that θεῖον would not do as well. P. 141: Westman again convinces that fr. 29 Usener should include a sentence more than is printed in *Epicurea*. P. 263: Westman corrects a common misinterpretation of 1126A (he is not, of course, the first to translate it right—the Latin versions in the older editions do) and defends πολεμική against the emendation πολιτική. P. 183: second thoughts are perhaps needed about Westman's ingenious proposal to delete δῖχα at 1108C (p. 175, 3 Pohlenz). I feel this makes the emphatic πάσης πανταχόθεν ἐξελαθείσης inexplicable, and prefer to assume a considerable omission, as most editors have done.

The usefulness of this thesis is increased by its indexes and summaries. The whole is, in short, a thoroughly serviceable piece of work, which scholars engaged in similar fields will find helpful to consult, not least for its bibliography.

D. A. RUSSELL

St. John's College, Oxford

MANUEL F. GALIANO, FRANCISCO R. ADRADOS, JOSE S. LASSO DE LA VEGA: *El Concepto del Hombre en la Antigua Grecia*. Pp. 126. Madrid: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 1955. Paper.

THESE three lectures, delivered at a Summer School in Santander in 1954, make the first publication of the Classical Philology section of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters at Madrid. They are connected by some common themes: men's reflections on the place of man in society and in the universe, and the development from the 'aristocratic' exclusiveness of 'archaic' times to the 'universalism' and *φιλανθρωπία* which dominated many minds in the Hellenistic era. The first lecture deals with the 'archaic' period, and resolves itself into a synopsis of Alcaeus, Archilochus, Theognis, and Pindar on human relations and experiences, finding here much 'humanity' but no 'humanism' in default of any systematic view of mankind as sharing a common nature and common rights. The second lecture is concerned with the developments in fifth- and fourth-century Athens. Here the sophistic movement is

described as essentially destructive; it gave an impetus to individualism, relativism, subjectivism. The Sophists created 'pure humanism' in the sense that they tended 'to recognize nothing extraneous to man', thus conferring on him an autonomy which meant freedom from all rules not of his own creation. In reply, Socrates sought to create 'a rational morality based on objective grounds'; but since the norms which he established were not the external norms of tradition but developed within the individual, his new ethics were 'totally individualistic' in accordance with the spirit of his time. The lecturer has obviously been compelled to simplify for the sake of clarity and brevity; but I think he might have refrained from strengthening his thesis by the unwarrantable assumption that Socrates did nothing towards purifying the religious traditions and ignored the gods in working out his doctrine of morality as the tendence of the soul. At any rate Plato saved 'objectivity' once more by founding a new religion based on the Idea of Good; but apparently 'humanism', as here understood, suffered in the process, since man could no longer be defined 'without reference to the divinity' who is now his model. The third lecture makes a valiant attempt to outline the achievements and characteristics of the Hellenistic age. It includes a short treatment of the spread of Greek ideas to Rome. The author defines humanism as a combination of humility and solidarity. I do not think his colleagues would agree that humanism is no more than an attitude of mind or feeling—in its various forms it is never the same thing as humanitarianism, but implies a background of intellectual ideas capable of being expressed and discussed. The author makes an interesting protest against the reduction of the history of Greek culture to 'pampedagogismo'. I should have liked some expansion of this criticism of the school of Jaeger. In general, if the authors had aired their personal opinions more freely, I believe their lectures, competent and informative as they are, would have made more vivid and enjoyable hearing.

J. TATE

University of Sheffield

K. A. DE MEYER: *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis, Codices Manuscripti. vi: Codices Vossiani Graeci et Miscellanei*. Pp. xxiv+319. Leiden: University Library, 1955. Paper, fl. 20.

THE highest standards of clarity, concision,

and c
this d
laneou
quired
for 30
hundre
the O
collecta
them
rules
Graeci,
pour le
gres re
for the
the U
Meyier
graphi
requir
Acc
scripts
three
Swede
is del
howev
used s
manus
lème
194-2
bers o
quarte
titles
Voss.
graph
phian
43 tw
'Gem
But t
rately
in the
not li
scriba
identi
photo
the A
sixth
and
index
ful fea
great
Pol. I
tribu
more
Rena
'Il n'
plus
érudi
jusqu
mani

Unive

and completeness have been observed in this description of the Greek and miscellaneous manuscripts of Isaac Vossius acquired in 1690 by the University of Leiden for 30,000 florins. There are over two hundred, from a fifth-century parchment of the Old Testament to seventeenth-century *collectanea*. The same accuracy is devoted to them all, on the standard set forth in the rules used by cataloguers of the *Vaticani Graeci*, more exigent than the *Règles à suivre pour la confection des catalogues de manuscrits grecs* recently prepared by Abbé M. Richard for the Commission des Éditions Savantes of the Union Académique Internationale. De Meyier gives, for instance, more bibliographical information than Richard's rules require.

Accurate material description of the manuscripts includes watermarks and bindings, three of which have the arms of Christina of Sweden. Vossius's mode of acquiring these is delicately described. One is surprised, however, to find the term 'bombycinus' still used since J. Irigoin's article, 'Les premiers manuscrits grecs écrits sur papier et le problème du bombycin', in *Scriptorium* iv (1950), 194-204. De Meyier has retained the numbers of the 1716 catalogue, grouped by folio, quarto, octavo, and miscellaneity; and the titles too seem to come from that source, e.g. Voss. Gr. F. 1. is titled 'Liber mappas geographicas XXVIII ad Ptolemaei geographiam, ut videtur, accommodatas.' In Misc. 43 two of Pletho's funeral orations are titled 'Gemistae monodia in dominam Helenam'. But the actual contents are always accurately described. Though Q. 57 is ascribed in the title to (Constantine) Lascaris, he is not listed in the *Index auctorum*. The *Index scribarum*, some of whom De Meyier has identified by comparison of writings through photographs, can be slightly extended from the *Addenda et Emendanda* at pp. xxii-iv. The sixth index is a repository of *Incipit* of works and fragments difficult to recognize. The *index palaeographicus* is another specially helpful feature. In compilation and proof-reading great help has been given by Dr. E. Hulshoff Pol. Leiden scholarship deserves the warmest tribute for this critical catalogue, a task much more difficult than is commonly realized. Renan well wrote (*Avenir de la science*, p. 217): 'Il n'y a pas un travail qui exige un savoir plus étendu. . . . Et pourtant, les recherches érudites seront entravées et incomplètes jusqu'à ce que ce travail soit fait d'une manière définitive.'

D. C. C. YOUNG

University of St. Andrews

GUILLAUME STÉGEN: *Étude sur cinq Bucoliques de Virgile*, 1, 2, 4, 5, 7. Pp. 111. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1955. Paper.

THE author justifies producing yet another book on the Eclogues in a manner which gives the reader a good opinion of the material on which Belgian secondary education has to work. It seems (p. 4) that bright pupils are apt to ask, in effect, what the poems are all about and if we really understand them as works of literature, apart from contemporary allusions, allegories, and so forth. He therefore sets out to provide criticism, primarily aesthetic, on five which seem to him particularly difficult from this point of view, and on which certainly a vast deal of imperceptive writing has been spent; he disposes of some of it, for instance, on pp. 25, 28-29, and elsewhere. His own belief (p. 8) is that each poem is a unity and makes complete sense even if we neglect all secondary meanings and forget, for example, that Menalcas is on occasion Virgil himself. It remains to ask how well he applies this sound principle, in other words if his criticism is good literary interpretation.

In the reviewer's opinion it varies greatly in value. There is something to be said for his suggestion (p. 27) that *Ecl. i* is 'une petite comédie dont tous les éléments sont nécessaires ou vraisemblables'. Meliboeus, according to him, is all the while looking for a night's lodging and with that in view, he first makes sure that Tityrus can give him one, then arouses his sympathy and listens patiently to his long tale about his own good fortune, till finally the expected invitation comes. He classifies (pp. 36-37) Corydon's themes in *Ecl. ii* according to a credible system, and gives reasons no worse than those produced by others, in fact better than most, why Thyrsis loses the singing-contest in *Ecl. vii* (pp. 101 ff.). But besides some positive blunders (p. 58, n. 2, he misses the idiomatic point of *vincet* in iv. 55; p. 83, *uiris* in iii. 7 has nothing to do with deference to elders; p. 93, the expression *damnabis uotis* in v. 80 has no suggestion of 'le malin plaisir de condamner les agriculteurs à s'acquitter de leurs vœux' but is a familiar ritual technicality) he commits himself to some highly doubtful statements and strange interpretations. Thus, on p. 20, n. 2 and again on pp. 29 f. he makes strange work of so familiar a figure as apostrophe. On pp. 30 f. he falls into the stock error of imagining that Corydon's Cyclops-song is sung in his own person (*Ecl. ii. 19-27*; cf. my *Eclogues of Vergil*, pp. 33-36, a book of which he seems never to have heard). On

p. 101 he finds in Meliboeus' simple expression, *posthabui tamen illorum mea seria ludo* (vii. 17) 'le plan du chant amébée lui-même: les plaisirs d'abord, les travaux ensuite', which plan incidentally he discovers at the cost (p. 100) of some very forced explanations. But he is at his worst in expounding the Fourth Eclogue. He begins by adopting (p. 40) the many times refuted suggestion that the wonder-child is Pollio's own, despite the objection of Warde Fowler, which he never fairly faces, that Virgil never mentions or hints at Pollio being anyone's father. He supposes (p. 75) that the child will become a god before ruling the world as predicted in line 17, and that it shall be when he is a god that the golden age will return, although lines 37 ff. say plainly that this will happen in his human manhood, *ubi iam firmata uirum te fecerit aetas*. Most extraordinary of all, he would have us believe that Virgil's hoped-for celebration of the child's exploits will seriously contribute to his deification (pp. 56, 63; the latter speaks of 'la crédulité du peuple romain qui permettrait à un poète . . . de faire passer un être humain pour un dieu, ou pour un futur dieu'). The best that can be said for this section of the monograph is that it rejects some of the more absurd explanations of certain other scholars.

The printing is good; I do not know whether *Hérodien* for *Hérodote* on p. 47 is a misprint or a slip of the author's pen.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

MARY M. INNES: *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*. A new translation. Pp. 394. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1955. Paper, 3s 6d. net.

It is pleasant to observe that the *Metamorphoses* have now been metamorphosed into a Penguin, and have survived their dissolution into prose without undue discomfort; *veteris servant vestigia formae*. Although Ovid robbed of his 'numbers' is sadly impoverished, his resources as a story-teller can still keep up appearances and afford agreeable entertainment to the reader. Nevertheless, for epigrams that click into place, for speeches where the rhetoric is rather more at home, and for tales which, if less faithfully told in detail, in their general effect mirror more clearly the Ovidian spirit, one turns to the translation into heroic couplets made by Mr. A. E. Watts in 1954.

Miss Innes's aim has been 'to produce a version which, while remaining faithful to the text, offers pleasant and easy reading,

even to the non-classicist', and if one regards the work as a whole, this aim has been achieved. She would appear to have followed in the main F. J. Miller's text in the Loeb Classical Library and has occasionally taken a phrase from his translation. But her prose is more natural and her interpretation sometimes more accurate than the Loeb translator's. Her version reads well, and slips (e.g. iv. 733 *rupis* . . . *iuga prima* 'sharp pinnacles of the rock'; xv. 351 *sulpura* 'saffron') seem very rare.

Yet in spite of Miss Innes's concern for him the non-classicist may at times be puzzled. For example, xv. 325-8 is not fully intelligible unless the reason for the madness of Proetus' daughters is known, and on p. 142 one is left to guess that 'the daughters of Achelous' were the Sirens. Similarly, 'the Actaeon maiden' (p. 167) and 'the younger son of Atreus' (p. 309) require special knowledge. It would have been better to replace patronymics and their like more widely by proper names or pronouns, for they are often little more than poetical conveniences, and even if you expand them, as Miss Innes frequently does, by rendering, say, *Thessalus* as 'Thessalian Erychthon' (p. 216), the effect is unsuited to prose.

The book has a sound introduction, though Miss Innes is hardly justified in stating that Ovid was a friend of Horace (p. 10); *Tr.* iv. 10. 49-50, the only evidence, is inconclusive, even if taken in conjunction with Horace, *Sat.* i. 4. 73. The section on the *Metamorphoses* in later literature is particularly useful. There is an index of proper names.

A. G. LEE

St. John's College, Cambridge

ÉDOUARD GALLETIER: *Panegyriques latins*. Texte établi et traduit. Tome iii (xi-xii). (Collection Budé.) Pp. 140. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1955. Paper.

THIS volume concludes the work of which volumes i and ii were reviewed in *C.R.*, n.s. ii (1952), 31 and iv (1954), 304, respectively. It contains the two longest of the Panegyrics, apart from Pliny's, namely Claudius Mamertinus' *Gratiarum Actio* to Julian at Constantinople, shortly after Constantius' death, on the occasion of the orator's elevation to the consulship in A.D. 362 (E. Bachrens xi; W. Bachrens iii), and Latinus Pacatus Drepanius' expression of Gallic satisfaction at the defeat of Maximus, addressed to Theodosius at Rome in the

summer of A.D. 389 (E. B. xii; W. B. ii). The occasions of these speeches are of obvious interest, and the orators are personages upon whom our knowledge of them from external sources confers an interest mainly lacking in the case of their predecessors. Mamertinus appears, not uniformly to his credit, in the pages of Ammianus Marcellinus, and Professor Galletier suggests with probability that the sober historian made some use of this florid rhetorician as a source in connexion with Julian. As for Pacatus, his interest has been lately brought into relief in Mrs. Chadwick's *Poetry and Letters in Early Christian Gaul* (Bowes & Bowes, 1955). He was a friend both of Ausonius and of Symmachus, and in him the series of Panegyrics ends, as it began, with a Gallic orator. His speech is of genuine historical importance inasmuch as it is, when all allowance has been made for the reserve of an official spokesman, a primary source for the 'usurpation' of Maximus, an episode not lacking in mysterious elements, by which the orator's homeland had been directly affected.

Galletier pursues the excellent scheme of his two former volumes, each of the speeches being introduced by essays on the personality and associations of the orator, the circumstances in which his speech was delivered, and the historical and literary value of the oration. There are again explanatory notes appended to the translation and supplementary notes following the text; and this final volume has also a concordance table and indexes covering the three volumes.

The editor's high standard of correctness and propriety in translation is fully maintained; a certain diffuseness in the rendering of authors themselves not characterized by brevity may be accepted as conducing to full and accurate representation of the orators' sometimes exaggerated subtleties of meaning and expression.

The text calls for little comment. It continues to be sensible and eclectic, and will be found to differ in a good many places from the later Teubner editor, W. Baehrens. Sometimes, as in the previous volumes, Galletier goes back to earlier corrections or to a long-discarded manuscript reading (e.g. Mamertinus iv. 4, where he gives a colon after *quaerebat* and suppresses the *et* of *edd. uett.* and the Teubner editors). In one case at least (Mam. xi. 4) he seems to have undone a predecessor's good work in restoring *u's ei parandae sunt picturae*, etc., corrected by Livineius to *ei parandae sunt picturae*, etc. In Pacatus xi. 6 he adopts Baudouin's attractive *moribus* (for *moenibus*), known to but rejected by E. and W. Baehrens. In Mam. xvii. 2 he admits the

unsatisfactory conjecture *uirili*; the only proper (if necessary) correction is the excision of *ab aetate puerili* (Livineius). The few emendations made by G. himself are innocuous rather than impressive; but *obiciebantur* in Mam. iv. 2 is a more commendable supplement than those previously suggested.

I have noticed few misprints, but a curious slip is the attribution of two different dates, viz. 1 January and 1 June, to Mamertinus' speech.

All those interested in late Latin oratory, and in the history of the period covered, have reason to be grateful to Professor Galletier for the excellence of his work and for the expedition with which it has been completed.

W. S. MAGUINNESS

King's College, London

GÖSTA SÄFLUND: *De Pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 80, viii.) Pp. xi+223. Lund: Gleerup, 1955. Paper, Kr. 25.

This important treatise, which will probably necessitate a revision of the dates assigned to several of Tertullian's works, contains a good deal more than its title-page suggests. The text of *De Pallio*, arranged in cola (a device necessary to the author's argument, but which makes for very difficult reading) is printed in full, with only a few critical notes. Part ii, on the date and character of *De Pallio*, contains a detailed discussion of the phrase *praesentis imperii triplex virtus*, which, in conjunction with *Deo tot Augustis in unum favente*, is shown to be inapplicable to 193, 197, and 211, the dates hitherto suggested. A digression on *subnovo* proves it to be unlikely that this description applies to Domitian: its context requires some more recent emperor, and one of bad morals, which Domitian was not: it does, however, entirely suit Heliogabalus. So, the author claims, the *triplex virtus* will be Severus Alexander, Julia Mamaea, and Julia Maesa, who are known to have been far from hostile to Christianity: which places the date of composition not long before 223, and makes *De Pallio* one of Tertullian's later works. The adoption of the pallium will then mark neither Tertullian's conversion to Christianity nor his acceptance of Montanism, but his secession from both churches to form his own sect of Tertullianists: it will also mark his *antiromanitas*, a new African-nationalist standpoint, which was not inconsistent with loyalty to the Empire and the emperors. The reviewer can only

add that he thinks this theory is in accordance with the facts, and that it will demand serious consideration.

Part iii attempts the justification of this later date by the detailed consideration of the development of Tertullian's style. The argument here is concerned with a number of small points (the use of *et* for *etiam*, asyndeton, syndeton, and anaphora, and much more of this kind, set out in comparative tables) and is too close to summarize. A general observation is that it is a mere assumption, resting on no tangible evidence, that the 'precious' style necessarily marks the book as an early work.

The rest of the book treats of questions arising out of this discussion. The two books now known as *De Cultu Feminarum* were placed under this common title only by Rigaltius: the manuscripts and the early editors call Book i *De Habitu Muliebri*. Considerations of style suggest that Book ii is considerably earlier than Book i, and the diverse tone of their contents makes it unlikely that they are two parts of one single work. Book ii, rightly named *De Cultu Feminarum*, belongs to the premonastan group (*De Oratione*, *De Baptismo*, etc.), while Book i, with its less humble tone and its intolerably offensive manner, is marked by Montanist rigorism. It had already occurred to the reviewer that it is Book ii to which Tertullian refers at *De Oratione* 21.

Another question that arises is the relation of *Adversus Judaeos* to parts of *Adversus Marcionem* iii, and the authenticity of the latter part of the former work, which has been held to be a late-fourth-century compilation from *Adv. Marc.* The author proves at some length that the suggestion that the scriptural quotations here are based on the Latin vulgate is without foundation, and by a detailed analysis of style shows the substantial homogeneity of the work, though it appears that in the course of writing the scope of the work became fuller than was at first intended. Here again we think he makes out a strong case, and several accepted theories will have to be revised.

Copious indexes add to the book's value. There are a number of misprints in the Latin, some of which are capable of causing difficulty.

E. EVANS

B. L. ULLMAN: *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. Pp. 395; 10 plates. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1955. Paper, L. 4.500.

PROFESSOR ULLMAN'S decision to collect several

of his essays in a volume will certainly prove welcome to classical scholars. For despite its title, many of the studies in this book bear directly on classical studies and particularly on such authors as Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, Sallust, and Livy. One will note with regret the absence of the many papers contributed by Ullman on medieval florilegia, and although one can see that they would hardly have been suited to a volume of Renaissance essays, one will all the same miss their presence very much. The essays collected here are not mere reprints. For Ullman has not only added a considerable amount of very valuable information to the original texts and brought them up to date, but has also included in this volume a number of hitherto unpublished papers which add new and important information on subjects connected with classical and Renaissance scholarship.

Of particular interest for the textual history of Propertius is the paper on the Sorbonne library, where it is established among other things that the poems of Propertius were in Petrarch's hands and that the manuscript of them owned by him was a copy of one in the Sorbonne library, a fragment of which is now at Leiden. The paper on Hieremias de Montagnone and his citations of Catullus has been considerably expanded. Perhaps one may be unable to agree here that Bencuis of Alexandria had seen Catullus before 1310, as Ullman states following Sabbadini. On the other hand, it is possible to suggest, for various reasons too lengthy to give here, that the well-known Latin epigram, in which Benvenuto Campesani hailed the return of Catullus, was probably written between 1303 and 1307. The list of manuscripts of Hieremias de Montagnone's *Compendium* given in the original article has now been considerably enlarged. As the list includes references to copies of the *Compendium* now no longer extant but registered in old library catalogues, one may add to it the copy which was in the library of St. Eustorgio at Milan during the late fifteenth century, when it was entered in the inventory of that library, and the one entered in the inventory of the Vatican Library drawn up during the pontificate of Pope Nicholas V.

The problem whether Petrarch had a direct knowledge of the poems of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius is clarified in a masterly essay now printed for the first time. Not new but considerably enlarged is the paper on Poggio's manuscripts of Livy, which originally appeared in the 1933 volume of *Classical Philology*. It is not only Poggio's Livian manuscripts which are studied here;

for Ullman
copied
gives al
the opp
Phillipp
agree en
being re
pression
hand w
with so
from ac
was the
nexion
add tha
for the
Vatican
Nel Cin
(Vatica
edition
graph
discover
interest
papers,
of Porm
the "V
quite c
classica
by scho
Leto.
the "C
manus
during
come i
Catull
It is
of coll
import
is, how
chapte
topics
and stu
Filippo
find h
import
interes
not be
the ma
cester.
clude
express
for ma
able to

Univers

FRAN
Bucol
Iecch

THIS

for Ullman deals also with other manuscripts copied by Poggio now extant, of which he gives also a very welcome list. Having had the opportunity of examining the former Phillippus 12278, I should like to state that I agree entirely with Ullman's doubts as to its being really in Poggio's hand. My own impression when I examined it was that the hand was very much like that of Poggio but with some differences which prevented one from accepting implicitly the view that he was the scribe of the manuscript. In connexion with Poggio's manuscripts one may add that among the volumes in preparation for the famous '*Studi e Testi*' collection of the Vatican Library, announced in the volume *Nel Cinquantesimo di Studi e Testi 1900-1950*, (Vatican Library, 1950), p. 79, there is an edition by Dr. A. Campana of Poggio's autograph copy of the eight orations of Cicero discovered by him in 1417. Of considerable interest for Sallust is another of the new papers, dealing with 'The Dedication Copy of Pomponio Leto's Edition of Sallust and the "Vita" of Sallust', where it is proved quite convincingly that the 'Vita' is not a classical work, as had been hitherto believed by scholars, but was written by Pomponio Leto. The volume ends with a paper on the 'Codices Maffeiiani', dealing with the manuscripts owned by the Maffei family during the Renaissance and including welcome information about the Maffeiiani of Catullus and Cicero's *Philippics*.

It is most unusual to find a volume of collected essays in which each is an important contribution to its subject. This is, however, the case with this volume. The chapters dealing with purely Renaissance topics are also important and stimulating, and students of Petrarch, Coluccio Salutati, Filippo Villani, and Leonardo Bruni will find here plenty of material of exceptional importance for their studies, while anyone interested in early English humanism will not be able to afford to overlook the essay on the manuscripts of Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester. It is accordingly only fitting to conclude a review of this admirable volume by expressing one's thanks to Professor Ullman for making all this valuable material available to us in book form.

R. WEISS

University College, London

FRANCO MUNARI: *Marci Valerii Bucolica*. Pp. 103. Florence: Vallecchi, 1955. Paper, L. 1,200.

THIS collection of *Eclogues* which passes

under the name of Marcus Valerius and is an interesting product of the so-called twelfth-century Renaissance, was already known to scholars in the provisional edition of Paul Lehmann, in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, iv (1946). We must welcome the critical edition which has now been provided by Dr. Munari, with full apparatus criticus and a valuable introduction, in which he deals, among other things, with the questions of authorship and of date. The poems, which are definitely and carefully 'antichizzanti', are probably pseudonymous, though the name Valerius is found in medieval use, and we can agree with the editor that their place of origin may conceivably be some French monastery or some French Cathedral school. At any rate, they are a remarkable witness to the close study of classical models and, in particular, of Virgil, Calpurnius, and Nemesianus, in places where Latin verse was composed and appreciated.

F. J. E. RABY

Jesus College, Cambridge

P. J. G. GUSSEN: *Het Leven in Alexandrië volgens de cultuurhistorische Gegevens in de Paedagogus (Boek ii en iii) van Clemens Alexandrinus*. xvi + 140. Assen (Holland), Van Gorcum, 1955. Paper, fl. 6.90.

DR. GUSSEN reopens a much-discussed question: can the account (explicit or implicit) of life and manners given by Clement of Alexandria in his *Paedagogus* be accepted as a true description of contemporary life in Alexandria, or is it a literary picture? When one recollects that Clement castigates feminine frivolity by quoting fifteen lines from Aristophanes which enumerate half a hundred articles in a lady's wardrobe, one can sympathize with those who dismiss his testimony. Gussen refuses to accept such dismissal, and his defence of Clement consists in an examination of (1) the sources of Clement's quotations relative to the objects of everyday life; (2) the methods by which these quotations reached Clement—did he read the originals or did he come to know them only by way of an anthology? (3) the manner in which he handled such borrowings. The result claimed for this inquiry is 'that it is possible almost always to confirm the historical value of quotations which depict situations in Alexandrian life, whether thanks to the immediate context or other passages of Clement himself, or thanks to

other contemporary information of various kinds'. After a similar investigation into the requirements of literary form, especially that of the diatribe as a genre, Gussen proceeds to collect in a final chapter Clement's statements about the life of his time under such headings as eating and drinking, dress, trinkets and jewellery, furniture, public life and morals, etc.

For all their erudition and generous scale, Gussen's inquiry and answers are no less subjective than those of his predecessors. He has not succeeded in defining criteria (probably they cannot be defined) which will allow the second question to be answered to the point of demonstration. It is therefore to be regretted that he has ignored the papyrus evidence on the true but irrelevant ground that the soil of Alexandria has proved too damp for the preservation of papyri. Alexandrians are and were to be found elsewhere than in Alexandria. The Alexandrian civil servant Theophanes in the early fourth century travelled through Palestine and Syria and left extensive memoranda and financial records of his travels, including details of his wardrobe. The wills, marriage settlements, and other papers of other Alexandrians more closely contemporary to Clement have survived at various places in the Egyptian *chora*, and would have been worth scrutiny. Seeing that the subject under consideration is 'daily life' the witness of contemporary papyrus documents, even though they may not have concerned Alexandrian citizens specifically, would have been worth while on lexical grounds alone. A sample check of Clement's own words for food-dishes, articles of clothing, and bed-linen, etc., shows that only a few of them make an appearance in documentary papyri, and these few are found on closer examination to be classical terms that have maintained themselves. For example, P. Stud. Pal. XX. 67, 12 and Ryl. 627, 25 show that *γανάκης* (which Gussen terms a 'Persian fur-coat') was still applied to a bed-covering. But in Clement's context (vol. i, p. 204 Stählin, Clement's own words, not a quotation), where it is listed alongside *χρυσόπαστους τάπιδας καὶ χρυσοποικίλους ψιλόταπιδας εὐσιδᾶς τε ἀλουργᾶς* (of which only *εὐσιδᾶς* is found once in a papyrus, and that of the third century B.C.), it is hard to avoid the suspicion that Clement uses it because it is a striking Aristophanic word. Another case: Clement forbids piercing for ear-rings *εἰς ἀπάρτησιν ἑλλοβίων καὶ πλόστρων*. These are literary words, not found in papyri where the constant term is *ἐνώτιον*. To me this suggests that Clement's vocabulary is overwhelmingly literary, and that he does not call a spade a

spade. His statements on matters of daily life may be true, but doubts will persist.

Whether or not one endorses Gussen's conclusion, he touches on many questions of fundamental importance for Clement's methods of work, indeed for the aims and status of the catechetical school of Alexandria. Moreover, his inquiry is set out with clarity at every stage so that other inquirers, whether into the *Realien* or into the culture history of Egypt's capital will have reason to be grateful for his statement of the evidence.

E. G. TURNER

University College, London

D. KANATZOULIS: *Μακεδονική Προσωπογραφία*. ('Ελληνικά, Παράρτ. ἀρ. 8.) Pp. 183. Thessalonica, 1955. Paper.

MACEDONIAN prosopography has already been dealt with in several studies, e.g. in a general way by O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache u. ihr Volkstum*, pp. 116 ff. ('Die makedonische Personennamen'), and I. I. Russu, 'Onomasticon Macedonicum' (a work which Kanatzoulis does not mention) in *Ephemeris Dacoromana*, 7 (1938), 163 ff.; more specialized prosopographies are, for the times of Alexander the Great, H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Munich, 1926, and, for the period from Alexander the Great to 168 B.C., P. Schoch, *Prosopographie der militärischen und politischen Funktionäre im hellenistischen Makedonien* (323–168 v. Chr.), Diss. Basel, 1919, a work which exists only in typewritten copies, J. Papastavru, 'Prosopographia Amphipolitana' in *Klio*, Beiheft 37 (1936), 59 ff., and Mabel Gude, *A History of Olynthus with a Prosopographia and Testimonia*, Baltimore, 1933. In this present volume, a bi-product of his work on the Macedonian Koinon (notably τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μακεδόνων in *Μακεδονικά* 3, 27–102 and τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Μακεδόνων καὶ τὰ συνέδρια τῶν μερῶν in 'Ελληνικά, Παράρτ. ἀρ. 4 (1953), 294–304), Kanatzoulis has attempted to fill in the gap from 148 B.C. to the time of Constantine the Great.

It may seem that the 1,522 items of Kanatzoulis's work is a meagre harvest from such a rich field as Macedonia in a period stretching over nearly 500 years, but this paucity is partly due to deliberate selection. The principles governing the inclusion and exclusion of names is set out thus in the preface: *περιλαμβάνει δὲ ὅχι πᾶν ὄνομα, τὸ ὅποιον συναντᾷμεν εἰς τὰς μακεδονικὰς ἐπιγραφὰς καὶ ἄλλας*

ἀφορώσας
ὀνόματα
τῆς ἐπο-
τεχνητων
κῶν, οἱ
λων, ἀξι-
προσώπων
τρόπον
καὶ τὴν
ἐμφανίζ-
ιδιότητά
ἐπεσκέψ-
αὐτῇ κα-
των. 'Εν-
τὰ ὅποιοι
ἐμνημον-
ὡς ὁ ἄλλοι

In m
of any
ness, ar
sarily o
very ma
names
are ex
above;
include
names
or not
1519 of
Philipp
ending
τις ἀγν
would
whose

So n
uninter
especial
to be c
some c
irrelev
author
noticed
Vulic'
but no
(1931)
the so
are un
is to b
his co

Univer

W. I
bourr
encyc
mus,
Lato
A ho
cipal

ἀφορώσας εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν πηγὰς, ἀλλ' ὀνόματα ἀρχόντων τῶν μακεδονικῶν πόλεων ἢ τῆς ἐπαρχιακῆς ἐνώσεως τῶν Μακεδόνων, τεχνιτῶν, ἐπαγγελματιῶν, Ρωμαίων διοικητικῶν, οἰκονομικῶν καὶ στρατιωτικῶν ὑπαλλήλων, ἀξιωματοῦχων τῆς χριστιανικῆς ἐκκλησίας, προσώπων, τὰ ὅποια εὐηργέτησαν ἢ κατὰ τινα τρόπον ἐξυπηρέτησαν τὰς μακεδονικὰς πόλεις καὶ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, καὶ ἐν γένει παντὸς προσώπου, ἐμφανιζομένου εἰς τὰς πηγὰς ὑπὸ ἐπίσημόν τινα ἰδιότητα. προσέτι ἐπιφανῶν ξένων, οἵτινες ἐπεσκέψθησαν τὴν Μακεδονίαν ἢ διέμειναν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ὠφέλησαν ταύτην διὰ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν των. Ἐπὶ πλείον περιελήφθησαν καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα, τὰ ὅποια ἦλθον εἰς σχέσιν μὲ τοὺς ἀνωτέρω. Δὲν ἐμνημονεύθησαν ὁμοῦ πρόσωπα πασίγνωστα, ὡς ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος, ὁ Ἅγιος Δημήτριος κ. ἄ.

In my view a prosopography, if it is to be of any value, must at least aim at completeness, and an arbitrary selection must necessarily deprive it of usefulness and interest; very many of the most interesting Macedonian names encountered in sepulchral monuments are excluded by the principles enunciated above; on the other hand Kanatzoulis includes in nos. 1480 to 1522 officials whose names have been preserved either partially or not at all, and we are informed under no. 1519 of the existence of a certain soldier from Philippi whose name consisted of six letters ending in -us, and under 1522 of παιδαγωγός τις ἀγνώστου ὀνόματος! My own preference would be for individuals, however obscure, whose names are recorded.

So much for the deliberate omissions; the unintentional are more difficult to trace, especially as Kanatzoulis leaves something to be desired in his citation of publications, some of his references being over-full and irrelevant and often lacking the name of the author of the article in question; I have noticed that he makes much use of N. Vulić's last work in *Spomenik*, 98 (1941-8), but none of his earlier studies in *Spomenik*, 71 (1931) and 75 (1933). In passing I note that the sources for at least eleven of the entries are unpublished inscriptions from Beroea; it is to be hoped that Kanatzoulis or some of his colleagues will soon publish these.

J. M. R. CORMACK

University of Reading

W. DEONNA: *De Téléphore au 'moine bourru'*. Dieux, génies et demons encapuchonnés. (Collection Latomus, xxi.) Pp. 168; 50 figs. Brussels: Latomus, 1955. Paper, 250 B.fr.

A HOOD, generally attached to the principal garment, was very common wear in

antiquity, especially among the lower classes. It is therefore not surprising that hooded figures are common in ancient art, including that of the Roman provinces. But a hood cuts its wearer off more or less from the surrounding world, and therefore can have a symbolic value, typifying separation, which includes the radical separation between death and life. Therefore by no means all hooded figures are simply representations of everyday persons (peasants, slaves, and so on), but include, besides the godling Telesphoros, who attaches himself to the family of Asklepios, many other minor divine or daemonic beings, or what are thought with considerable plausibility to be such. Deonna has collected a very great number of representations of hooded persons, a large proportion of them being children, as the hood was apparently a very common feature of childish dress, irrespective of social standing. He tries to explain and interpret them, with varying success; for although showing moderation and not infrequently (e.g. pp. 37, 127) refusing to be drawn into too wide generalizations, he is somewhat over-ready to accept an explanation which supposes chthonian powers to be meant (as pp. 70, 106, 115) and to lend an ear to the unpicturesque mythology of sundry psychologists.

Necessarily, references to ancient texts are frequent, and much revision is wanted here. Far too many are not to the originals but to the pages of French translations, e.g. of Plutarch. Others are loose (as p. 28, n. 1, where we find simply 'S. Jérôme, *Épître*. xxii', though that work fills 18 folio pages) and now and then grossly careless in addition; *ibid.*, n. 5, 'ESCHYLE [*sic*], *Trachiniennes*' is hardly satisfactory when the passage meant is Soph., *Trach.* 94 ff.

But despite these defects and not a few passages in which a bit of ancient testimony is given a doubtful or definitely wrong interpretation, Deonna has done a useful piece of work in assembling so much curious material, extending beyond antiquity to medieval and modern folklore, and giving it some sort of classification which may serve as a guide to future researches.

H. J. ROSE

St. Andrews

CARL BLUEMEL: *Greek Sculptors at Work*. Translated by LYDIA HOLLAND. Pp. 85; 68 figs. London: Phaidon Press, 1955. Cloth, 25s. net.

THE first edition of Professor Blümel's treatise on the technical methods of Greek sculpture in marble appeared in 1927, and since

he is a sculptor as well as an archaeologist his judgements are of unusual value. The Phaidon Press deserves praise for deciding to present them in English.

Greek Sculptors at Work is a translation of the German *Griechische Bildhauer an der Arbeit*, of which I know the third but not the fourth edition. The illustrations differ only in that most are larger and better printed, one drawing has been replaced by a photograph, and there has been some shuffling of their order. In the text the author has made a few minor alterations—the date of the Hermes of (or not of) Praxiteles and the present whereabouts of a few pieces cited; incidentally the fake of fig. 15 is now on loan in the Museum of Classical Archaeology in Cambridge. Other discrepancies are the translator's, who is smooth in her English but faulty in her German. I give some corrections of slips and faults of terminology and of the much more serious mistranslations.

P. 22, ll. 21–22: rather 'The sculptor had blocked out the figure on all four sides in broad planes meeting at right angles'. P. 23, l. 2: 'Tool' rather than 'hammer'. P. 29, l. 16: delete 'a'. P. 34, l. 3: 'parallel', not 'perpendicular'. P. 37, l. 21: 'on the outside of which is attached' for 'which is attached to'. P. 37, l. 26: 'by way of' rather than 'across'. P. 39, l. 21: 'plane' for 'space'. P. 40, l. 23: 'pediments', not 'frieze'. P. 43, l. 1: 'strength' rather than 'consistency'. P. 43, ll. 20–21: 'overlapping parts', not 'superimposed planes'. P. 45, ll. 1–4: this should be: 'It must strike everyone who examines the little moulds from Tarentum and the plaster casts made from them that the moulds are not easily recognizable as moulds at first glance. Again and again the figures appear to stand out in relief, though lighted from a direction opposite to that from which the casts are lighted.' P. 46, ll. 2–3: rather 'who as cutters of gems and stamps were masters of the art of working in intaglio'. P. 46, ll. 10–11: perhaps 'translating into' rather than 'carrying out in'. P. 47, l. 8: 'front of the plinth'. P. 48, ll. 10–11, etc.: 'Herm', not 'Herma'. P. 48, l. 14: 'perhaps', not 'probably'. P. 51, last line; p. 53, ll. 1–2; p. 70, l. 6: 'metopes', not 'metope'. P. 52, l. 6: 'stage' rather than 'period'. P. 53, l. 15: 'arrangement' rather than 'traces'. P. 63, ll. 12–14: this should be: 'But speed also was important and the result was that he could hardly have more completely renounced the essentials of Classical sculpture.' P. 66, last line: 'lion-head water-spouts' would be better. P. 77, l. 1: 'lightly engraved', not 'more deeply accentuated'. P. 77, l. 4: 'the edge of a shield', not 'one of

the borders'. P. 77, l. 10: 'gradually' rather than 'slowly'. P. 79, l. 7: 'Hellenistic', not 'Hellenism'. P. 83, ll. 12–13; p. 84, l. 1: 'pulpit' or 'throne', I think, not 'chance'. The list of illustrations has also many curious errors.

Even so, the Phaidon Press has improved on its previous ventures in Classical archaeology, *Etruscan Sculpture* and *Roman Portraits*. *Greek Sculptors at Work* is not much worse than slovenly.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

EARLE R. CALEY: *Chemical Composition of Parthian Coins*. Pp. 104. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1955. Paper, \$ 2.50.

THIS study is useful primarily as an illustration of the kind of information that can be obtained from analyses of the metallic composition of coins and of the manner in which such analyses should be conducted.

The author has analysed chemically some twenty-two Parthian drachms ranging from the early second century B.C. to the third century A.D., of which the majority were of Orodes I (57–37 B.C.). His results show that the silver content of the earlier coins was usually as high as 90 per cent., but during the reign of Orodes it dropped to between 75 per cent. and as low as 40 per cent.; for later reigns the figure seems to remain fairly steady at about 75 per cent. The exceptional debasement under Orodes may reflect the numerous wars of the time, both with local rivals and with Rome. Though copper is found to be the main alloying component, the presence of a notable proportion of tin implies that it was not introduced into the alloy in a pure state, but as bronze; in fact, the alloying components of Parthian drachms are so similar to the components of Parthian bronze coins as to make it likely that the latter were the source of the bronze alloy in the drachms. The analyses also provide some support for the reasonable supposition that Orodes obtained the silver for his drachms by melting down the drachms of his predecessors. It is worth noticing that compared with the decline in the fineness of the Roman denarius during the early centuries A.D., the Parthian drachm appears to remain constant, although few coins of this period have so far been analysed.

Analyses of Parthian tetradrachms somewhat surprisingly reveal a different story. No specimens analysed contained much more than 50 per cent. of silver; there

seemed to be a steady decline in fineness from reign to reign. Moreover, a lower proportion of tin implied that the alloy for the tetradrachms was formed from relatively pure copper instead of bronze. These facts raise the question of the economic relationship between the drachms and the so-called tetradrachms. Though the latter are usually only slightly less than four times the weight of the drachms, they never contain anything approaching four times as much silver, and in intrinsic value can sometimes be rated only as didrachms. The differences in composition and homogeneity of metal between tetradrachms and drachms suggest that they were struck at separate mints.

The last three sections deal with specific gravity measurements, in which there are numerous sources of inaccuracy. For example, the drag of the water on the suspending wire can make the estimated specific gravity of a small coin so inaccurate as to be valueless as an indication of fineness. The presence of corrosion products with a low specific gravity may be another source of error; some coins, too, were found to be so porous that their weight increased gradually upon immersion. The conclusion is reached that only when specific gravity is very high can it be a reliable guide to fineness.

C. M. KRAAY

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

KONRAD KRAFT: *Der goldene Kranz Caesars und der Kampf um die Entlarvung des 'Tyrannen'*. (From *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte*, 3 and 4, 1952-53.) Pp. 97; 4 plates. Kallmünz (Oberpf.). Michael Lessen, 1955. Paper. DM. 10.

THIS study grows out of an observation which has, surprisingly, hitherto eluded historians, numismatists, and archaeologists alike. Upon coins Caesar is portrayed wearing a head-dress, which has regularly been described as a laurel wreath. This it cannot be, for it lacks wreath ties, and projects in a solid mass well beyond the brow. From the evidence of comparable representations in other media Kraft shows that such peculiarities are typical of an artificially constructed crown of Etruscan pattern consisting, in its front part at least, of a triple row of small oval leaves. Literary evidence records that among the insignia of the kings of Rome Caesar wore a golden crown. Kraft argues that upon his coinage Caesar is shown wearing such a crown—the old regal crown of Etruscan

origin, which under the Republic became the triumphator's crown.

This convincing identification provides a new factor in the old problem of the position that Caesar intended to occupy in the government of Rome. This Kraft discusses at length, and rightly insists that Caesar was a monarch and intended to remain one. But in what outward insignia and titles was his status to be expressed? Kraft reasonably rejects the idea that on any sane calculation could Caesar have desired either the title *rex* (which would have brought him nothing but unpopularity) or, as symbol of his monarchy, the diadem of the despised and conquered Hellenistic monarchs. The coinage shows that Caesar's choice was the old regal-triumphal crown as symbol, and *imperator* (which accompanies the crown on the coinage) as title, no longer to be used intermittently in Republican fashion, but permanently together with the crown.

Caesar's crown also helps to date Caesar's coinage, for Cicero (*de div.* i. 119) states that Caesar first wore the royal dress at the Lupercalia on 15 Feb. 44 B.C., by which time he was *dictator perpetuo* (Cic. *Phil.* ii. 87); yet on the still earlier denarii of M. Mettius, upon which Caesar is entitled *DICT QVART*, the crown is already being worn. Hence it must follow (1) that the permissive decree (Dio xlv. 6. 1) was passed sufficiently before 15 Feb. to allow time for the small issue of Mettius, and (2) that on the denarii of Mettius Caesar was represented wearing the crown before he had worn it in person.

Light is thrown also upon a puzzling group of Augustan coins, the Numa asses, of which Kraft has observed that there are two series, one with the head of Augustus, the other with that of Caesar wearing his distinctive crown. On account of this latter series he connects the whole group of Numa asses closely with the denarii of M. Sanguinius of 17 B.C. (which also bear a head of Caesar), and thus gains a further argument in support of the dating of the Augustan moneyers which he proposed in *Mainzer Zeitschrift* 1951-2.

C. M. KRAAY

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

KARL LEHMANN: *Samothrace: a Guide to the Excavations and Museum*. Pp. 101; 51 figs., folding plan. New York: New York University Press, 1955. Paper, \$ 2.50.

SINCE 1863 there have been several expeditions to the sanctuary at Samothrace, notably

Conze's in the 1870's and Lehmann's since 1938, and the history of the site is now fairly clear. This guide, which is straightforward and informative, should be very useful to the visitors for whom it is intended. For other students it has a limited usefulness. But of necessity the architectural descriptions are summary and the exposition of the cult dispenses with much of the evidence. The illustrations show some negligence. Of the plans Fig. 22 needs a scale and the replotting of the sanctuary, Fig. 25 does not identify its scale, and the folding sheet at the end is without bearings (in fact the top is East). The reconstruction, Fig. 18, should have a hipped roof, unequal doorways in the partition, and a grandstand to the side of them. Of the objects photographed most have no note of size. In the text the bridge with a 'span of ca. 20 meters' deserves comment.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

B. HUNNINGHER: *The Origin of the Theater*. Pp. 139; 48 plates. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1955. Cloth, fl. 14.50.

This book opens with words discouraging to the classical scholar. 'Though the problems surrounding the dramatic art of our times are many, one of them seems to have been definitely and permanently solved—the problem of origin. That origin lies in the medieval Christian Church.' This opening undergoes considerable modification in the course of the book: but Hunningher is mainly concerned with the survival of religious ceremonies going back to prehistoric times,

and the relation of Christian rites and the medieval church to drama. But in Chapter 3, 'The Archaic Phase', some space is found for Greek drama, though a good deal of the chapter is devoted to a general description of Dionysiac ecstasy.

Hunningher is acquainted with the *Poetics* and much of the main modern literature on the subject: extensive use is made of Pickard-Cambridge's *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*. But it was not from such sources as these that he derived statements like 'Archilochos [sic] of Paros told how in 675 B.C. when he was archon, he sang the dithyramb when drunk' (p. 39). His linguistic scholarship might be more accurate, too: he translates *Ar. Poet.* 1449³11 τῶν τὰ φαιλικὰ as if it were τῶν φαιλικῶν. He is sometimes misleadingly silent on important matters, as when (p. 43) he quotes without comment Aristotle's statement that the Dorians derived comedy from κῶμη. His allusions to Greek religion are often oversimplified, as in the unqualified identification of Sabazius with Dionysus (p. 32), the reference to 'the Orphic mysteries, sacred to Dionysus' (p. 35), and the description of Dionysus as the 'god of the masses' (p. 34).

But apart from points of detail, and even considered within its chosen limitations, the book gives an impression of incoherent exposition, in part due to its having been written before the author had fully assimilated his reading: and one cannot predict that it will be found very useful.

There are several misprints, some recurring. The book is provided with an appendix of footnotes and references, and an index.

D. MERVYN JONES

Exeter College, Oxford

FESTSCHRIFTEN

Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag dedicatae. (Eos, Vol. xlviii, fasc. 1.) Pp. 589. Warsaw: Ossolineum, 1956. Cloth, zł. 76.

W. L. Westermann, Upon the Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity (19); H. Lévy-Bruhl, Note sur les contacts entre les systèmes juridiques (27-33); E. Berneker, Hochverrat und Landesverrat im griechischen Recht; P. Frezza, Παράκαταθήκη; H. I. Bell and B. R. Rees, A repudium from Hermopolis (175); E. Boswinkel, La médecine et les médecins dans les papyrus grecs (181); M. David, Ein Beitrag zu P. Col. 123, 13-17 (191); J. Gerstinger, Zehn byzan-

tinische Urkunden und Briefe der Sammlung 'Papyrus E. rzog Rainer' in Wien (197); N. Lewis, Τὴν φροντίδι τῶν οἰκείων πραγμάτων ἐξαρκεῖν (217); N. N. Pikus, Ἐπιβολή (221); F. Pringsheim, Some Suggestions on P. Col. 123 (237); E. Seidl, Die juristische Bildung der Richter in Ägypten (251); A. Steinwenter, Vis maior in griechischen und koptischen Papyri (261); W. Till, Die koptischen Arbeitsverträge (273); E. P. Wegener, The entolai of Mettius Rufus (P. Vindob. G. Inv. 25824, v-vi. 7) (331); H. J. Wolff, Zwei Miszellen (πράξις-Klausel und κυρία-Klausel, zu P. Univ. Mil. 25; Zu P. Giess. 40, col. i) (355); H. C. Youtie, Linguistic Notes on Papyrus Texts

(P. Ryl. iv. 595, P. Princeton ii. 70, P.S.I. xii. 1259, P. Mich. v. 230, P. Berl. Inv. 11042, P. Warren 20, P.S.I. x. 1103 and P. Fam. Tebt. 41, P. Princeton iii. 153 and P. Oxford 18) (373); A. Berger, *Interdicta noxalia* (395); G. Grosso, *Dies veniens* (415); M. Kaser, *Condictio iuris und condicio tacita* (421); G. I. Luzzatto, *Il verba praeire delle più antiche magistrature romano-italiche* (439); E. Schönbauer, *Neue Rechtsquellen zum Constitutio Antoniniana Problem* (473); S. Solazzi, *Su Gai. 1. 199-200* (499-503); J. C. van Oven, *Gaius 3. 158 mandatum post mortem mandantis* (529); E. Volterra, *Sulla D. 1. 5. 24; G. Wesenberg, Zur Dogmengeschichte der schuldrechtlichen confusio* (553); F. Wieacker, *Zum Ritual der adoptio* (579-89).

Hommages à Max Niedermann. (Collection Latomus, xxiii.) Pp. 352. Brussels: Latomus, 1956. Paper, 525 B. fr.

F. R. Adrados, *Quelques traitements phonétiques des laryngales indo-européennes* (17); H. Bardon, *Tacite, Hist. 3. 21-24 — Thucydide, 7. 43-44* (34); M. S. Beeler, *Venetic and Italic* (38); E. Benveniste, *Sacrilégus* (49); J. Béranger, *De Sénèque à Corneille, Lueurs sur Cinna* (52); G. Bonfante, *Nota sui nomi indoeuropei delle parti di corpo in latino* (71); E. Bréguet, *Horace, un homme libre* (82); A. Deman, *Tacite, Hist. 1. 67-68* (90); G. Dumézil, *Remarques sur les trois premières regiones caeli de Martianus Capella* (103); E. Dutoit, *Le souci étymologique chez Tite-Live* (108); A. Ernout, *Consus — Ianus — Sancus* (115); C. Favez, *Aquitains et Gaulois chez Sulpice-Sévère* (122); P. J. Grosjean, *Romana Stigmata* chez Gildas (128); E. A. Hahn, *Dum in Main Clauses* (140); W. Havers, *Zum primitiven Gebetsegoismus* (159); L. Herrmann, *A propos du petit navire de Catulle* (164); J. Heurgon, *Le lemme de Festus sur Orcus* (222 L.) (168); J. Hubaux, *Rimes, assonances et consonances dans Properce, iv. 3* (174); R. B. C. Huygens, *Zur dritten Romreise des Egidius von Paris* (179); H. H. Jansen, *qu et gu in latin* (184); W. J. Koster, *De metro calabrio deque versibus miuris* (191); A. Labhart, *Investigabilis = ἀνεξιχνίατος* (199); M. Lejeune, *L'Inscription gauloise de Bréona* (206); M. Leroy, *Latin mare* (216); M. Leumann, *mausoleum — mausoleum* (224); A. Maniet, *La 'Loi de Lachmann' et les antinomies de l'allongement compensatoire* (230); J. Marouzeau, *Quelques traces de l'aspiration initiale en*

latin (238); C. Mohrmann, *Domus Dei* chez saint Augustin (244); D. Norberg, *Contributions à l'étude du latin vulgaire* (251); L. R. Palmer, *The Concept of Social Obligation in Indo-European* (258); V. Pisani, *Feber, fimbria, ollaber* (270); E. Polomé, *Veionis = Vofigno-?* (274); J. G. Préaux, *Pelusiota* (286); G. Redard, *Le rajeunissement du texte de Plaute* (296); M. Renard, *Pline l'Ancien et le motif de l'asarôtos oikos* (307); F. Thomas, *Dominance et résistance dans la syntaxe latine* (315); A. Tovar, *Loci Propertiani* (324); M. van den Bruwaene, *L'épithète de Iuno Moneta* (329); J. Vendryes, *Participe passé et supin* (333); R. Verdière, *Notes critiques sur Perse*.

Commentationes in honorem Edwin Linkomies sexagenarii a.d. mcmlii editae. (Arctos, N.S. i.) Pp. 210. Helsinki: Otava, 1955. Paper, 1,500 mk.

The main contents are: Y. M. Biese, *The distinction between meaning and thing meant and the treatment of interjections in Latin grammarians* (G.); E. Burck, *'Amor in Plaut. Trin. 223 ff. and Prop. ii. 12'* (G.); P. Bruun, *'The Consecration Coins of Constantine the Great'* (E.); I. Düring, *'Aristotle the Scholar', on the formative influences on A.'s personality and scholarly method* (E.); A. Ernout, *consensus, concensus and consentaneus* (Fr.); R. Hakamies, *medieval uses of tintinnabulum ('copper') and equitium ('a day's work for a horse')* (Fr.); U. Knoche, *the idea of friendship in Seneca's Letters* (G.); H. Koskeniemi, *Cicero and the genera of letter-writing* (G.); J. Marouzeau, *'Ordre de mots et realia'* (Fr.); E. Mikkola, *abstract plurals in Isocrates* (G.); T. F. Mustanoja, *Latin and French proverbs from a Sidney Sussex manuscript, J. 2. 12* (E.); P. Oksala, *Cicero's use of Greek* (G.); O. Rudberg, *'Kunstprosa und Hymnenstil'*; J. Suolahti, *the social origins and connexions of Catullus* (E.); J. Svennung, *'Numero' ('no.') prefixed to a serial figure is of Italian, not, as the dict. suggest, of Latin origin* (G.); H. Thesleff, *the origin of the idiom ὡς ἀληθῶς* (G.); V. Väänänen, *the partitive use of de* (Fr.); A. Zilliaceus, *an early Byzantine monastic document from a Bodleian papyrus, Gr. Class. C. 42* (E.). Two contributions in Italian are connected with the opening in 1954 of the Finnish Institute in Rome (in the Villa Lante on the Gianicolo): a survey of Roman cultural influences on Finland by T. Steinby and an inaugural lecture on *'Parallelismo fra Grecia ed Italia nelle migrazioni preistoriche'* by J. Sundwall.

Natalicium Carolo Jax septuagenario a.d. vii Kal. Dec. mcmlo oblatum. Edidit Robertus Muth, redegit Ioannes Knobloch. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Band 3, Heft 2, 3.) Pp. 73-166, 167-272. Innsbruck: Sprachwissenschaftliche Seminar der Universität, 1955. Paper, S. 46, 48.

Heft 2 (Altertumswissenschaft — Humanismus): K. Pivec, Die Briefsammlung des Petrus de Vineia (73); P. Gächter, Zur vision vom sonnenbelauchten Weibe (Apoc. 12) (85); F. Hampl, Beiträge zur Beurteilung des Historikers Tacitus (89); K. K. Klein, Die Anlage der Trajanswalle in der Dobrudscha und die Goteneinfälle des vierten Jahrhunderts (103); R. Muth, Zur Frage der Erkenntnis der Naturgesetzlichkeit durch die griechische Philosophie bis Platon (111); F. Schachermeyr, Alexander und die Ganges-Länder (123); B. Griesser, Die Handschriften-Fragmente aus dem Berliner Ansegi-Kodex als Textzeugen der Expositio iv Evangeliorum des Ps.-Gregorius (137); K. Ilg, Zu den Trulli des fernsten Italien (143); A. Wotschitzky, Hochhäuser im antiken Rom (151); K. Völk, Ein Beitrag zur Chronologie und Geschichte des ersten peloponnesischen Krieges (159); E. Thummer, Zu Pindar, Isthmia viii. 70 (165).

Heft 3 (Sprachwissenschaft): H. Ammann, *Miscellanea Latina* — (i) Cäsars Geheimschrift an Q. Cicero, (ii) Zu lat. *ardere, audere* (167); J. Bruch, Die lateinischen Namen der Fledermaus (181); A. Kuhn, Lat. *passio* im Gallo-Romanischen (189-96); J. Knobloch, Reste von Singulativbildungen im Indogermanischen (207); G. Pfligersdorffer, Zu *miscellaneus* (217); Edith Raybould, How far was English Syntax affected by Latin in the Age of Dr. Johnson (221-9); F. Gschnitzer, τὸ Ἑλληνικόν neben οἱ Ἕλληνες (261-7).

Studi in onore di Gino Funaioli. Pp. xii+440. Rome: Signorelli, 1956. Paper, L. 10,000.

F. Altheim, Griechisches Geisteserbe in Iran (1); J. Bayet, Un procédé virgilien — la description synthétique dans les Géorgiques (9); L. Castiglioni, Due note alle Bucoliche di Calpurnio e Nemesiano (19); C. Cecchelli, 6 6 6 (Apoc. xiii. 18) (23); P. J. Enk, De Propertii elegia ii. 4 (32); A. Ernout, (*H)abundo* — *habeo* (37); P. Ferrarino, Struttura e spirito del poema lucreziano (40);

S. Ferri, Ad Vitruv. vii praef. 16 (65); M. F. Galiano, Una vez más sobre Herodas (67); C. Gianelli, È Francesco Petrarca o un altro Francesco il destinatario del 'De primatu Papae' di Barlaam Calabro? (83); P. Giuffrida, Elogia o parodia? — Hor. Epist. ii. 1. 118-138 (98); M. Guarducci, Albunea (120); L. Herrmann, Stace interpolateur de Virgile et de Columelle (128); H. Herter, Comprensione ed azione politica — a proposito del c. 40 dell' Epitafio tucidideo (133); G. Jachmann, Eine Studie zum homerischen Schiffskatalog (141); K. Kerényi, Varro über Samothrake und Ambrakia (157); M. A. Levi, Aspetti sociali della poesia di Giovenale (170); E. Longi, Tre episodi del poema di Lucano (181); U. Mancuso, Orazio — dalla originalità del poeta civile al provato valore del combattente (197); E. Malcovati, Ad Cic. Fam. ix. 21. 3 (216); S. Mariotti, La Struttura del Bellum Poenicum di Nevio (221); A. Mazzarino, Ricupero di un vocabolo latino (Cato, Agr. 28 *caparidam*) (239); S. G. Mercati, Tre noterelle lessicali (241); A. Monteverdi, Per un verso di Enrico da Settimello (246); B. Nardi, Corsi inediti di lezioni di Pietro Pomponazzi (253); B. Pace, Metamorfosi d'Ifigenia (284); A. Pagliaro, Troia qui primus ab oris (288); M. Pallottino, Spigolature Etrusco-Latine (299); U. E. Paoli, La legislazione sull'adulterio nel diritto di Gortina (306); E. Paratore, Briciole filologiche (*nequitum* o *nequitum*?) c. 95 di Catullo; a Verg. Aen. iv. 456; Ligdamo e Ovidio; Ovidio e la Phaedra di Seneca; Petr. 95-96; Quint. i. 2. 6: Inserzioni novellistiche nelle Metam. Apuleiane (317); M. Pellegrino, Sull'antica biografia cristiana (354); G. Perrotta, De lapsu Susannae ii. 5, v. 19, vii. 33 (360); R. Pettazzoni, Borea bifronte e l'omniscienza di Aër (370); G. B. Pighi, De Atiediorum cletra (373); B. Riposati, Agostino o pseudo-Agostino? (378); A. Ronconi, Osservazioni sulla lingua del Somnium Scipionis (394); A. Rostagni, Da Aristofane e da Antifane ad Aristotele (406); W. Schmid, Il gregge stolido e il suo giudizio politico (Carm. Einsiedl. 2. 21) (418); N. Terzaghi, Eumolpo e Peregrino (426); A. Traglia, Sopra alcune consonanze fra il c. 66 di 'Catullo' e gli Aratea di Cicerone (434).

Navicula Chiloniensis: Studia philologica Felici Jacoby professori Chiloniensis emerito octogenario oblata. Pp. x+215. Leiden: Brill, 1956. Cloth, fl. 30.

G. Müller, Der homerische Ate-Begriff und Solon's Musenelegie (1); W. Marg, Das

erste Lied des Demodokos (16); F. Wehrli, Hesiods Prometheus (Theogonie 507-616) (30); O. Seel, Herakliden und Mermnaden (37); H. Diller, Zwei Erzählungen der Lyders Xanthos (66); H. Haffter, Die Komposition der pseudoxenophontischen Schrift vom Staat der Athener (79); R. Harder, Inschriften von Didyma, Nr. 217, v. 4 (88); A. Thierfelder, Obscaenus (98); O. Skutsch, Zur Medea des Ennius (107); H. Dahlmann, Catus oder Cato? Noch einmal der Titel von Varros Logistoricus (114); H. Fuchs, Nachträge in Ciceros Brutus (123); W. Theiler, Ein griechischer Historiker bei Sallust (144); E. Burck, Der korykische Greis in Vergils Georgica (156); U. Knoche, Tibulls erste Liebeslegie (iii. 19) (173); E. Koestermann, Das Charakterbild Galbas bei Tacitus (191); H. J. Mette, 'Bedeutend' (207).

Festschrift Bruno Snell. Zum 60. Geburtstag am 18 Juni 1956 von Freunden und Schülern überreicht. Pp. viii+257. Munich: Beck, 1956. Paper, DM. 24.

K. Reinhart, Zum homerischen Aphroditehymnus; E. Kapp, Casus accusativus; P.

Maas, Hephthemimeres im Hexameter des Kallimachos; K. Latte, Zu Theokrits Hylas; K. von Fritz, Das Prooemium der hesiodischen Theogonie; H. Diller, Der philosophische Gebrauch von κόσμος und κοσμεῖν; H. Rudolph, Die lykurgische Rhetra und die Begründung des spartanischen Staates; W. H. Friedrich, Episches Unwetter; U. Knoche, Zur Frage der epischen Beiwörter in Vergils Aeneis; J. G. Griffith, Author-Variants in Juvenal; W. Schmid, Philosophisches und Medizinisches in der Consolatio des Boethius; R. Güngerich, Tacitus' Dialogus und der Panegyricus des Plinius; W. Hoffmann, Die Polis bei Homer; E. Siegmann, Der Heidelberger Papyrus Inv. Nr. 1740 recto; A. Thierfelder, Zu einem Bruchstück des Epicharmos (254 K.); E. Fraenkel, Zur griechischen Volkskunde und Sprachforschung; R. Walzer, On the Legacy of the Classics in the Islamic World; U. Fleischer, Zu Cornelius Nepos; H. Erbse, Der erste Satz im Werke Herodots; R. Merkelbach, Ovid Metamorphosen 6. 280-283; H. J. Mette, Curiositas; H. J. Seiler, Lexikographie und Grammatik; H. Hartmann, Zur Function des Perfects; W. Spoerri, Quelques remarques au sujet d'un fragment d'Aristoxène.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

ERANOS

LIII (1955), iii-iv

M. Ventris, *Mycenaean Furniture on the Pylos Tablets*: transcribes, translates, and annotates linguistically and archaeologically the Tables of tablets, which enumerate and describe 11 τόρπειαι, 5 θόρνοι (cf. Cyprian θόρπαι), and 15 θράννες. J. A. Davison, *Quotations and Allusions in early Greek Literature*: examines sceptically the supposed early allusions to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but is ready to admit that Alcman knew an *Odyssey*. L. Bergson, *Zu drei Aischylos-Stellen: Suppl.* 882 ff., an epitheton ornans would be out of place in the context, so keep ἀντίστοροφον, 'headed about (for Egypt)', and reject the scholiast's ἀμφίστοροφον. Septem 590, εὐκηνον gives an apposite sense, as well as being lectio difficilior; ibid. 642, εὐθερον is as well

supported as εὐκηνον, and more suited to the scout's style, which eschews stock epithets. A. Önnersfors, *Zur Vermischung der Ausdrücke für Ortsruhe und Bewegung im Lateinischen*: gives many examples from all periods of intus = intro, from comedy for hac = huc, from various authors for qua, quacumque = quo, quocumque, and for nusquam = in nullam partem. E. Ingvarsson, *Zu Properz* 3, 5, 2: defends stant, with examples of stare = durative esse. T. Wikström discusses and emends a number of passages in Firmicus Maternus, *de errore profanarum religionum*. P. Bruun discusses *Some Dynastic Bronze Coins of Constantine the Great*. N.-O. Nilsson condemns iubeto ut certet in Virgil *Ecl.* 5. 15 on metrical grounds. E. L. Harrison reads cassum producere somnum in Horace, *Epist.* 1. 2. 31. G. Giangrande urbanely disposes of F. W. Lenz's interpretation (*Eranos* 1955, 61) of [Ovid] *de pediculo*.

MNEMOSYNE

4TH SERIES IX (1956), FASC. i

W. den Boer, *Hesiod's Mortar and Pestle* (*Works and Days*, 423-426): it is wrong to connect ἔξονα, ἄψιν, and ἀμάξη with a cart: they, and the rest of the passage, refer to a single composite instrument, a pounding-machine somewhat like the Chinese water-wheel (illustrated), but with only one axle, 7 ft. long; it probably had a wheel on each end, each turned to and fro by a man or woman, and this operated four pestles. B. A. van Groningen, *Théopompe ou Chamaeleon? A propos de Simonide* 137 B, 104 D: discusses this epigram on the Corinthian women's prayer to Aphrodite to give the Greeks love of battle against the Persians [for εἴξασθαι p. 12, l. 4 read εὔχεσθαι]; Chamaeleon's version is inferior to Theopompus', and the epigram probably refers to free women, not to hierodouloi. Audrey N. M. Rich, *The Cynic Conception of ΑΥΤΑΡΚΕΙΑ*: traces the origins in Democritus, Socrates, Stilpo, and Plato of this essentially Cynic concept, and outlines Aristotle's view of it. A. E. Douglas, *Cicero, Quintilian and the Canon of Ten Attic Orators*: this canon developed into its present form only by the second century A. D.; it was unknown to Cicero, and Quint. x. 1. 76 *cum decem simul (oratores) Athenis aetas una tulerit* should not be taken as referring to it. A. D. Leeman, *De initio c. 41 Dialogi de oratoribus*: for *forum* read *fama*, and in *Dial.* 16. 7 for *fama* read *ferme* (Pontanus *ferre*). J. H. C. Kern, *Deux coupes romaines à décoration en barbotine*: these two cups decorated in *barbotine* ('slip'), one from Carthage and now at Leiden, one from near Ventimiglia and now at The Hague, are of a type found in Liguria and Spain. W. J. W. Koster, *Libanius in Scholiis ad Aristophanem citatus*: Libanius is quoted not only in schol. *Ach.* 144 but in schol. *Plut.* 147, 221. H. Wagenvoort, *Ad Vergiliū Culicis vss. 35-38: currere* (35) depends not on *gaudet* but on *mollia*; Leo rightly defends *gaudet*; for *certain* (37) read *constet*. H. MacL. Currie, *Senecae ad Lucilium Lib. II Epist. III* (15), 8: for *mediatorisui habeat* (p) read *nec diatariam habeat* (*διατορία* = 'sonitus acutus', Theophr.). W. J. Verdenius, *Odyssey* 2, 203-4: *ισα* = 'the same as before', cf. *Soph. O.T.* 53, *Thuc.* vii. 27. 4 and the use of *ὁμοίος*.

4TH SERIES IX (1956), FASC. ii

J. C. Kamerbeek, *Sapphica*: comments on 1. 18-19 L.-P. (ἀψ σ' ἄγγιν), 2. 8 (read κῶμα κατάρπει), 31. 13 (defends ἃ δέ μ' ἰδρως

κακχέεται, and interprets the ἑκάδε of the Parisinus as ἑκτον' ἃ δέ, ἑκτον being a gloss = 'sixth symptom'), 16. 11-16, 94. 10, 96. 3-5, 96. 17 (read καρτέρωι βόρηται or βάρρηται), 98. 10-12 (read Χαονίας l. 12, perhaps with κλέος ἔκανε l. 10). A. J. Beattie, *Sappho Fr. 31*: in l. 9 reads ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσ' ἀπέσπε, in l. 13 ἦκα δὴ μ' ἰδρως χέεται, in ll. 15-17 *τεθνάνκην δ' ὀλίγω' πιδεύην* [φαίνομαι: ἀλλὰ(?) παντὶ πολμάτοις (or ἀντὶ πολμάτων) ἐπ' ἰσθὶ πόνητα . . .]; S. may be in love with the man, not with the woman, and in l. 7 we should perhaps read *ὡς γὰρ εἰσίδω*. M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk, *A Few Observations on the Text of Plotinus*: contests P. Henry's theory that, because *Enn.* iv. 7. 8⁵ is transmitted only by Eusebius, Eusebius must have used Eustochius' edition of P., and that the above passage, ll. 1-43, did not occur in Porphyry's edition; the passage is genuine; in the case of iii. 9 and iv. 2, identical except for a number of variants, it is possible that both versions were found by Porphyry among P.'s papers. C. C. van Essen, *Venus Cloacina: the sacellum of V.C. in the Forum* may have as its origin a purification ceremony, women after their menstrual period purifying themselves with myrtle branches in the *fossa* (*cloaca* > *cluo* = *purgo*; *Venus* > **uenes* 'desire'); Pliny, *N.H.* xv. 119 says that the Roman and Sabine men purified themselves there with myrtle after the rape of the Sabines; is there in the *cloaca* a magic parallel from the human body? cf. F. Müller's explanation of the name Delphi [on p. 144, for *coniugulum* (bis) read *-am*]. P. J. Enk, *Dislocation of Couplets in the MSS. of Propertius*: P.'s text long suffered from Scaliger's countless arbitrary transpositions; now some editors react by admitting only one or two in all; the requisite number must be more than the eleven allowed by Barber, which rightly include iv. 9. 71-72, e.g. ii. 32. 7-10 after 16 (*Latomus* 1955), ii. 18c. 31-32 after 28 (*homocomeson*), ii. 34. 77-80 after 66 (*tu canis* in each). W. J. Verdenius, *Two Notes on Sappho Frag. 1*: in l. 17 μάλιστα goes with ὄντι; V. explains ll. 18-19 much as Kamerbeek, *supra*. H. Wagenvoort, *Ad Sen. De vita beata* 6, 1: there is no need to change *cogitationes ad futura* (-am Lipsius) *praemittat* or *futura* (*obfutura* Erasmus) *pro optimis adpetuntur*. J. Gonda, 'Streckformen' in Greek: such forms as *βέξικάζεται* = *βικάζεται*, *σκηρίμπτεσθαι* beside *σκηπτεσθαι* do not indicate an otherwise obsolete affix, but are 'Str.', colloquial variants adding a syllable, such as are found in some modern languages. J. H. Loenen, *In Defence of the Traditional Interpretation of Xenophanes Frag. 18*: counters Verdenius' explanation (*Mnem.* 1955, 221).

W. J. Verdenius, *Xenophanes Frag. 1, 24*: it is doubtful whether ἀγαθὴν is the correct reading [but Hermann's ἀγαθόν, which V. does not mention, is generally accepted]. C. M. J. Sicking, *Euripide, Héraclès 344-350*: for τὰν καλλίσθιτον read τὸν κ., keeping αἰλιων (for the double obj. cf. 687-9, for the compound cf. καλλίσταις).

REVUE DE PHILOGIE

XXX. 1 (1956)

A. Ernout, *Venus — venia — cupido: venus* is originally a neuter common noun, of the type of *genus*, whose meaning is clear from such examples as *Lucr. iv. 1270, Virg. G. ii. 329: veneror* is first 'practise *venus*', then 'worship *Venus*', and is thence extended to other objects of worship: *vénor*, originally 'desire', is an intensive with lengthened stem-vowel (cf. *cēlo*—**cēlo*) and the specialized meaning 'hunt' is secondary: *venenum*, originally *φίλτρον*, is extended to mean *φάρμακον*: there is no evidence that *venia* has anything in common with this group of words except perhaps a radical of vague meaning. To represent *Ἐρως* as the personified *Venus*' son Latin used *cupido*, with a necessary change of gender: the anomaly of *cupido fem.*)(*Cupido masc.* leads Caesar and Cicero to prefer *cupiditas* (Caes. has *cupiditas* 10 times, Cic. 422 times: neither has *cupido*), but *cupido* comes back into later prose under the influence of poetry. F. R. Adrados, *Nouveaux fragments et interprétations d'Archiloque*: (1) attributes ἀκούε δὴ κακὸν λόγον (Bergk⁴, ii, p. 439) to epode 1, to follow fr. 88 A Diehl and introduce the fable of eagle and fox; (2) reconstructs the line πύγαργος εἰς μὴ τευ μελαμπέγῳ τύχῃς and assigns it to the same fable; (3) reconstructs the line παχεῖα, δῆμος, ἐργάτις, μυσάχρη and assigns to epode 8, an attack on Neobule; (4) in fr. 100 Diehl reads ἐμπλην ἐμεῦ τε καὶ Φόλου and assigns to the story of Heracles and Nessus. A. Rivier, *Remarques sur les fragments 34 et 35 de Xenophane*: examines δόκος and εὐκότα τοῖς ἐτίμουσι in relation to early Greek usage: X. is concerned to affirm both the reliability of sensual knowledge and the possibility of a knowledge of supra-sensible reality; he contrasts with empirical knowledge not a less true knowledge of the same sensible objects but a less certain knowledge, on another level, of a different kind of object. J. André, *A propos des noms de la consoude: σύμφυτον* is not a specific name but a generic name for plants credited with the virtue of healing fractures; identifies the several plants to which the name is applied by ancient botanists.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

XCIX. 1: 1956

G. C. Whittick, *Petronius 62. 5*: reads *mihi in animo, in nassa esse*. D. A. van Krevelen: *Bemerkungen zur Charakteristik der in den Argonautika des Apollonius auftretenden Personen*: the characters of the *Argonautica* bear the stamp of the poet's own times. G. P. Goold, *Observationes in Codicem Matritensem M. 31*: accounts for the omission of *Silius viii. 144-223* from the manuscripts, and reconciles the contradictory reports of *Politian* and *Cod. Matrit. M. 31* on the presence of *Stat. Silv. i. 4. 86a* in Pab. V. Buchheit, *Homer bei Methodios von Olympos*: studies the influence of *Homer's* metre, diction, and the stories of *Odysseus* and the *Sirens* and of the *Chimæra*, on *Methodios*. E. Schwentner, *Lat. anaglossarium*: a corruption of *anaglypharium*. Q. Cataudella, *Theognidea 903-930*: reads *θήσων* in 903, and attributes the elegy to *Euenus*. F. Stoessl, *Die Elektra des Euripides*: for *Sophocles Orestes* and *Electra* merely carry out *Apollo's* orders and are guiltless in murdering their mother: for *Euripides* they are guilty, and realize their guilt after the deed is done; in this realization are the seeds of their salvation by divine intervention. F. Hornstein, *Zu Ovid, Fasti iii. 798*: for *fatis* reads *fratri*. H. Hommel, *Nochmals zu dem 'verschollenen' Manuskript von Hermann Diels*: recounts the fate of the manuscript copies prepared by *Diels* for his course in 1920/1 at *Berlin*. J. B. Bauer, *Das Sprichwort Orac. Sib. iii. 737*: for the Jewish author *πάθραλς* means a sea monster recalling the *Leviathan* of *Job* and related passages.

SYMBOLAE OSLOENSES

FASC. XXXII (1956)

H. J. Rose, *Aeschylus the Psychologist*: discusses such topics as the youthful terrors of *Orestes*, the senile futility of *Danaus*, *Eteocles* as his own evil destiny, and the humours of the humbler characters. *Ignacio Errandonea, Das Enthyem in Antigenes Abschiedsrede*: defends the dramatic appropriateness of *Antigone* 904-20; *Antigone* becomes more human in weakly seeking a new reason for her position. H. Bengtson, *Aus der Lebensgeschichte eines griechischen Distanzläufers*: discusses the problems raised by inscriptional and other references to *Philonides*, a 'day-runner' in the service of *Alexander the Great*. F. Marstrand, *Die römische Soldatenration bei Polybios vi. 39. 12-15*: *Polybios*' informant meant by *modius* the double *modius* (*modius castrensis*); *Polybios* took him to mean the single *modius*,

and hence his Greek version of the amount needs to be doubled. J. R. Gjerlow, *Bemerkungen über einige Einleitungen zur direkten Rede in Vergils Aeneis*: deals with the uses of *inquit*, *ait*, *fatur*, etc., and compares the technique of earlier epic. H. Morland, *Der Hyrtacide in der Aeneis*: argues that, contrary to the opinion of some scholars, the passage concerning Nisus in the fifth book was composed earlier than the story of his death in the ninth. J. H. H. A. Indemans, *Das Lukas-Evangelium* xxiii. 45: against Skard (fasc. xxx. 100) there

is no peculiar medical theory here regarding a connexion of sleep with grief. H. Morland, *Zu Philumenos*: a note on the date of this pupil of Archigenes. V. Skanland, *Calor Fidei*: illustrates the patristic and medieval symbolism which equates the cold north with evil and heathendom; sometimes this northerly region is literally applied to Norway. E. Skard, *Zu Sallust*: on traces of moral philosophy and physical speculation in Sallust. S. Eitrem, *Varia*: mostly on demonology.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Comité International Permanent de Linguistes established under the auspices of Unesco has published a 'Bibliographie Critique de la Statistique Linguistique' which bears the date 1954 but which we have only recently received. The editor is Professor P. Guiraud of Groningen; additional material has been supplied by the Department of Linguistics at Harvard. The bibliography aims at covering all languages, ancient and modern, and there are sections dealing with Phonetics, Metre, Indexes and Concordances, Word-Frequency, Semantics, Morphology, Syntax; the editor explains in a modest preface that the range of the scattered material has made it difficult to achieve completeness and appeals for the co-operation of readers in improving the work. The section on Indexes and Concordances claims to be 'assez complète' for Greek and Latin texts; but we observe that three indexes to Latin authors which were published in the years 1937-9 (Dares, Cicero *de Inventione*, Frontinus) are missing.

For the occasion of the first Spanish Congress of Classical Studies, which was held in Madrid last April, the Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos produced a classified Bibliography of Classical Studies in Spain under the editorship of Professor F. Rodríguez Adrados. Besides books and articles on classical subjects written and published in Spain the lists include Spanish translations of relevant works in other languages (*El Legado de Grecia*, for example) and articles by Spanish scholars published in other countries. That a volume of more than 450 pages should have been compiled, edited, and published, as this has been, within the space of six months is an achievement which reflects great credit on the editor, his collaborators, and his printers.

A new journal of ancient history, *Κώκαλος*, is being produced by the University of Palermo under the editorship of Professor Eugenio Manni. Its primary purpose is to encourage and develop the study of Ancient Sicily but, like its eponym, the legendary Sicilian king who, as the editor observes, had his contacts with other parts of the Mediterranean world, it will cultivate wider interests as well, and exactly half of the first volume is occupied by an article on Lysimachus of Thrace by Giovanna Saitta. The other contents are 'Sui segni di scrittura eoliana di origine minoica' (G. P. Carratelli), 'Un milliarium del 252 A.C. e l'antica via Agrigento-Panormo' (A. di Vita), 'Il problema delle fonti per il xvii libro di Diodoro Siculo' (M. J. Fontana), 'I Mamertini in Sicilia' (A. Vallone). The journal is published by Libreria S. F. Flaccovio, Palermo, and the price of the first volume (1955), which has just appeared, is L. 1200. It is intended to issue a yearly volume of at least 160 pages.

An eighth supplementary volume of Pauly-Wissowa has been intercalated into the regular series. Among the longer items in its 634 pages are T. Pomponius Atticus (R. Ferges), St. Paul (E. Fascher), Pausanias (the traveller: O. Regenbogen, 45 pp.), Second Sophistic (K. Gerth, 32 pp.), Pan (F. Brommer, 29 pp.), Erinys (E. Wüst, 42 pp.), Praefectus Aegypti (O. W. Reinmuth: revised article), Centuria Praerogativa (C. Meier), Dalmatia (B. Saria), Pomptine Marshes (M. Hofmann, 54 pp.), Monument of Lysicrates (H. Riemann, 41 pp.), Ludus Troianus (C. Mehl), 'Εγγύη (Erdmann), Παιδες (A. Hug), Υποκυτής (K. Schneider), Talent (Lehmann-Haupt), Irrigation (A. W. van Buren) and Rye (L. A. Moritz): a series of zoological and botanical addenda (Finch, Hawk, Quail, Gadfly, Ray, Lentil, Woad, etc.) are covered in articles by H. Gossen and M. Schuster.

Recent months have been prolific in Festschriften. The volume of *Essays on Roman Coinage* presented to our own Harold Mattingly is appropriately 'designed to be practical as well as honorific'; it consists of a planned series of studies on aspects and problems of Roman coinage contributed by fourteen numismatists in recognition of the unique part which he has played, by his own work and by his inspiration, in the modern development of their science. (In the bibliography of Mr. Mattingly's writings which is prefixed, we notice that while the reviews of numismatic—and other—works which he has written for the *Numismatic Chronicle* are recorded, only one of the many which he has contributed to this journal is mentioned, and that one of his articles published in *C.R.* is given a wrong title.) Four others appear as parts of well-known series. The *Symbolae* offered to Raphael Taubenschlag of Warsaw on his seventy-fifth birthday form Volume xlviii, fasc. 1 of *Eos*, cloth-bound for this honorific purpose; most of the 32 articles (of which only three are in a Slavonic language, Russian) are concerned with the two fields in which he has been eminent, Roman Law and the law of the Graeco-Roman Egypt of the papyri. The *Hommages* dedicated to the memory of Max Niedermann of Neuchâtel, who died at an advanced age in 1954, appears as Volume xxiii of the Collection Latomus; of the 41 contributions many are philological, as is fitting, but others range, as he did, over Latin literature from Plautus to Gildas and beyond. The Finnish journal *Arctos* (*Acta Philologica Fennica*), of which two volumes appeared in 1930-1, has embarked on a new series with the *Commentationes* offered to Edwin Linkomies of Helsinki. The *Natalicium* for the septuagenarian Karl Jax of Innsbruck occupies six parts of *Innsbrucker Beiträge*; two of these are concerned with classical studies. The remaining three volumes are separately published miscellanies. The *Studi* offered to the veteran latinist Gino Funaioli, professor successively at Palermo, Messina, Milan, Bologna, and Rome, are forty in number and remarkably diverse in subject. The *Navicula* which greets the eightieth birthday of Felix Jacoby ranges from Homer to Tacitus but has a personal unity of a kind which is likely to be particularly gratifying to the recipient; all the sixteen contributors have been his pupils or his colleagues (or both) at Kiel. The *Festschrift* presented to Bruno Snell of Hamburg (the youngest of the recipients; the birthday commemorated is only his sixtieth) is primarily a Hamburg tribute, with twenty-three articles by pupils and friends. A list of the contents of these volumes appears on another page.

With these may be mentioned a gratulatory volume of another kind, the *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* presented to Hendrik Wagenvoort

on his seventieth birthday by his former pupils at Leiden and containing a collection of his own less accessible papers.

The seventh International Congress of Classical Archaeology will be held, after a long interval (the sixth was in 1939), at Pavia in September 1957. Information may be obtained from the Secretariate, Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia, Piazza S. Marco 49, Rome.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included in this list unless they are also published separately.

- Altheim (F.)** Römische Geschichte. Zweite, verbesserte Auflage. Band i: Bis zur Schlacht bei Pydna (168 v. Chr.). Band ii: Bis zur Schlacht bei Actium (31 v. Chr.). (Sammlung Götschen 19, 677.) Pp. 124, 129. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1956. Paper, DM. 2.40 each.
- Altheim (F.)** Römische Religionsgeschichte. Zweite, umgearbeitete Auflage. Band i: Grundlagen und Grundbegriffe. Band ii: Die geschichtliche Ablauf. (Sammlung Götschen 1035, 1052.) Pp. 116, 164. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1956. Paper, DM. 2.40 each.
- Baldry (H. C.)** Ancient Utopias. (Inaugural Lecture.) Pp. 24. Southampton: University, 1956. Paper, 2s. 6d.
- Bassols de Climent (M.)** Cornelio Tácito: Historias, libro cuarto. Edición y comentario. (Clásicos 'Emerita'.) Pp. xiv+200. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1955. Paper, 50 ptas.
- Bibliografía de los Estudios Clásicos en España (1939-1955).** Redactada por un grupo de estudiosos. Pp. xvi+453. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos, 1956. Paper, 100 ptas.
- Bibliographie Critique de la Statistique Linguistique.** (Comité International Permanent de Linguistes: Publications du Comité de la Statistique Linguistique, ii.) Pp. xix+123. Utrecht: Editions Spectrum, 1954. Paper.
- Büchner (K.)** Tacitus: Agricola, Germania, Dialogus. Übersetzt und herausgegeben. Pp. 334. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1956. Cloth, DM. 9.80.
- Capizzi (A.)** Protagora: le testimonianze e i frammenti. Edizione riveduta e ampliata con uno studio su la vita, le opere, il pensiero e la fortuna. Pp. 443. Florence: Sansoni, 1955. Paper.
- Cary (G.)** The Medieval Alexander. Edited by D. J. A. Ross. Pp. xvi+415; 9 plates, 5 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. Cloth, 52s. 6d. net.
- Copley (F. O.)** Exclusus Amator: a Study in Latin Love Poetry. (American Philological Association, Philological Monographs, xvii.) Pp. ix+176. Madison, Wis.: American Philological Association (Oxford: Blackwell), 1956. Cloth.
- Copley (F. O.)** Plautus: Rudens. Translated with an Introduction. (Library of Liberal Arts, 43.) Pp. vii+76. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956. Paper, 45 c.
- Daube (D.)** Forms of Roman Legislation. Pp. 111. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Daube (D.)** The Defence of Superior Orders in Roman Law. (Inaugural Lecture.) Pp. 24. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Deanesly (M.)** A History of Early Medieval Europe. Pp. 620. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Diès (A.)** Platon: Les Lois, livres vii-x. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 184 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper, 800 fr.
- Diès (A.), des Places (E.)** Platon: Les Lois, livres xi-xii; Epinomis. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 161 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper, 650 fr.
- Dörrie (H.)** Leid und Erfahrung. Die Wort- und Sinn-Verbindung $\mu\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu - \mu\alpha\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ im griechischen Denken. (Akad. der Wiss. in Mainz, Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl. 1956, Nr. 5.) Pp. 42. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956. Paper, DM. 3.
- Dornseiff (F.)** Antike und alter Orient: Interpretationen. (Kleine Schriften, i.) Pp. 444. Leipzig: Koehler und Amelang, 1956. Cloth, DM. 14.50.
- Duchemin (J.)** Pindare poète et prophète. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 390. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper, 1400 fr.
- Finley (M. I.)** The World of Odysseus. Pp. 191. London: Chatto & Windus, 1956. Cloth, 15s. net.

- Fischer* (H.) *Die Aktualität Plotins*. Pp. viii+218. Munich: Beck, 1956. Paper, DM. 18.
- Gentili* (G. V.) *Auximum* (Osimo). (Italia Romana: Municipi e Colonie, ser. i, vol. xv.) Pp. 174; 20 plates, 3 maps. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1955. Paper, L. 1,000.
- Gigon* (O.) *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien*. (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 7.) Pp. vii+208. Basel: Reinhardt, 1956. Paper, 15.60 Sw. fr.
- Gjerstad* (E.) *Early Rome. ii: The Tombs*. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 4^o, xvii: 2.) Pp. 327; 249 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1956. Paper.
- Green* (W. M.) *Augustini Contra Academicos, De Vita Beata necnon De Ordine libri. Ad fidem codicum recensuit, prolegomenis notisque instruxit W. M. G. (Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia, ii.)* Pp. 148. Utrecht: Uitgeverij Het Spectrum, 1955. Paper.
- Helmhold* (W. C.), *Rabinowitz* (W. G.) *Plato's Phaedrus translated with an introduction*. (Library of Liberal Arts, 40.) Pp. xvii+75. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1956. Paper, 40 c.
- Hörmann* (F.), *Bosl* (K.), *Dirlmeier* (F.), *Dölger* (F.), *Günther* (R.), *Koch* (C.), *Seel* (O.) *Aus dem Bildungsgut der Antike*. Pp. 160. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag, 1956. Cloth, DM. 9.80.
- Humphries* (R.) *Ovid's Metamorphoses translated*. Pp. xiv+401. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (London: Mark Paterson), 1956. Paper, 12s. 6d.
- Jax* (K.) *Natalicium Carolo Jax septuagenario a.d. vii Kal. Dec. mcmv oblaturum*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Band 3, Heft 2, 3.) Pp. 94, 106. Innsbruck: Sprachwissenschaftliche Seminar der Universität, 1955. Paper, S. 46, 48.
- Kalliphatidis* (K. I.) *Ἑρμηνευτικὴ Παρατηρήσις στὸν Διάλογο τῶν Μηνέων*, vi. Pp. 22. Thessalonica, 1956. Paper.
- Kanellopoulos* (P.) *Πέντε Αθηναῖκοι Διάλογοι, 51 ἕως 529 μετὰ Χριστόν: Ἑλλὰς καὶ Χριστιανισμός*. Pp. 233. Athens, 1956. Paper.
- Karouzu* (S.) *The Amasis Painter*. Pp. xii+46; 44 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. Cloth, 75s. net.
- Kazantzakis* (N.), *Kakridis* (I. T.) *Ὁμήρου Ἰλιάδα: Ἑμμέτρη Μετάφραση*. Pp. 401. Athens, 1955. Paper.
- Kennedy* (E. C.) *Roman Poetry and Prose: Caesar, Livy, Virgil, Ovid*. Pp. viii+231. London: Cambridge University Press, 1956. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Kitto* (H. D. F.) *Form and Meaning in Drama*. Pp. viii+341. London: Methuen 1956. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Kraay* (C. M.) *The Aes Coinage of Galba*. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 133.) Pp. x+125; 37 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1956. Paper, \$5.
- Krarup* (P.) *Rector rei publicae. Bidrag til Fortolkningen af Ciceros De re publica*. [With summary in English.] Pp. 211. Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1956. Paper, Kr. 11.75.
- Kristeller* (P. O.) *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*. (Martin Classical Lectures, xv.) Pp. 106. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Κώκαλος*. *Studi pubblicati dall' Istituto di Storia Antica dell' Università di Palermo*. Vol. i (1955). Pp. 191. Palermo: Flaccovio, 1956. Paper, L. 1,200.
- Kullman* (W.) *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias*. Untersuchungen zur Frage der Entstehung des homerischen 'Götterapparats'. (Deutsche Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, 1.) Pp. 161. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956. Paper, DM. 18.
- Lattimore* (R.), *Arrowsmith* (W.), *Bynner* (W.) *The Complete Greek Tragedies: Euripides, vol. ii—Cyclops, Heracles, Iphigenia in Tauris, Helen*. Translated with introductions. Pp. 264. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1956. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Lauffer* (S.) *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion. Erster Teil: Arbeits- und Betriebsverhältnisse, Rechtsstellung*. (Akad. der Wiss. in Mainz, Abh. d. Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Kl., 1955, No. 12.) Pp. 117. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1956. Paper, DM. 9.
- Lever* (K.) *The Art of Greek Comedy*. Pp. xi+212. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 21s. net.
- MacKay* (L. A.) *Janus*. (Univ. of California, Publ. in Class. Philol., vol. 15, No. 4.) Pp. 30. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956. Paper, 50 c.
- Marmorale* (E. V.) *Persio*. Pp. viii+352. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 2,000.
- Marrou* (H. I.) *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. Pp. xviii+466. London: Sheed & Ward, 1956. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Martin* (J.) *Arati Phaenomena*. Pp. xxvi+202. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 2,000.

- Merentitis* (K. I.) Πολιτισμός και γλώσσα ὑπὸ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν καὶ Ἰταλικὸν οὐρανόν. Pp. 88. Athens: Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐκδοτικὴ Ἐταιρεία, 1950. Paper.
- Merentitis* (K. I.) Gruß an Griechenland aus Wien: ein Beitrag zur Völkerverständigung. Pp. 28. Tübingen: Laupp, 1950. Paper.
- Merentitis* (K. I.) Φιλολογικαὶ εἰδήσεις ἐκ Τυβέργης. Pp. 111. Athens: Georgallidis, 1950. Paper.
- Merentitis* (K. I.) 'Καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη': Φιλολογικὴ καὶ θρησκευτικὴ ἀνάλυσις τοῦ ἀγγελικοῦ ὕμνου, Λουκ. 2. 14. Pp. 104. Athens: Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐκδοτικὴ Ἐταιρεία, 1950. Paper.
- Merentitis* (K. I.) Ἡ ἀπλοσύτης πρότασις τῶν κλασσικῶν γλωσσῶν. Μετὰ προλεγομένων ἐπὶ τῆς οὐσίας τῆς προτάσεως ἐν γένει. Pp. 224. Athens: Ἐπιστημονικὴ Φιλολογικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, 1952. Paper.
- Merentitis* (K. I.) Γλωσσικαὶ καὶ φιλολογικαὶ παρατηρήσεις. Pp. 32. Athens: Ἐπιστημονικὴ Φιλολογικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη, 1953. Paper.
- Mondolfo* (R.) L'infinito nel pensiero dell' antichità classica. (Il Pensiero Classico, No. 5.) Pp. xii+636. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 4,500.
- Neubecker* (A. J.) Die Bewertung der Musik bei Stoikern und Epikureern. Eine Analyse von Philodems Schrift De Musica. Pp. 103. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956. Paper, DM. 11.
- Ostrogorsky* (G.) History of the Byzantine State. Translated by Joan Hussey. Pp. xxvii+548; 6 folding maps. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. Cloth, £4. 4s. net.
- Rapisarda* (E.) Consolatio Poesis in Boezio: introduzione, testo e traduzione delle poesie della 'Consolatio Philosophiae'. Pp. xlix+57. Catania: Università (Centro di Studi sull' Antico Cristianesimo), 1956. Paper, L. 1,000.
- Richard* (M.) Asterii Sophistae Commentarium in Psalmos quae supersunt. (Symbolae Osloenses, fasc. suppl. xvi.) Pp. xxxiv+272. Oslo: Brøgger, 1956. Paper.
- Rowe* (A.), *Buttle* (D.), *Gray* (J.) Cyrenaica Expedition of the University of Manchester, 1952. Pp. ix+59; 6 plates, figs. and maps. Manchester: University Press, 1956. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Salvatore* (A.) Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta e sul testo della Ciris. i: Fonti manoscritte e edizioni antiche. Pp. 115. Naples: L'Arte Tipografica, 1955. Paper.
- Salvatore* (A.) Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta e sul testo della Ciris. ii: Commentario e testo critico. Pp. 156. Naples: Istituto Editoriale del Mezzogiorno, 1955. Paper.
- Schaefer* (M.) Cicero: De Officiis. Auswahl aus dem zweiten Buch. Pp. 40. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag, 1956. Paper, DM. 1.60.
- Schaefer* (M.) Cicero: De Amicitia. Pp. 32. Munich: Bayerischer Schulbuch-Verlag, 1956. Paper, DM. 1.60.
- Schwartz* (E.) Zur Geschichte und Literatur der Hellenen und Römer. (Gesammelte Schriften, Band 2.) Pp. x+355. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1956. Cloth, DM. 38.50.
- Sciroletto* (N.) A. Persi Flacci Saturac. Testo critico e commento. Pp. xviii+182. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 1,700.
- Seel* (O.) Pompeius Trogus: Fragmenta. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxiii+208. Leipzig: Teubner, 1956. Cloth and boards, DM. 7.40.
- Sellman* (R. R.) Roman Britain. (Methuen's Outlines.) Pp. 67; figs. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Seltman* (C. T.) Women in Antiquity. Pp. 224; 32 plates, 12 figs. London: Thames & Hudson, 1956. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Siegmann* (E.) Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung. (Veröff. aus der Heid. Papyrussammlung, N.F.) Pp. vii+98; 12 plates. Heidelberg: Winter, 1956. Paper, DM. 40.
- Skard* (E.) Sallust und seine Vorgänger. Eine sprachliche Untersuchung. (Symbolae Osloenses, fasc. suppl. xv.) Pp. 109. Oslo: Brøgger, 1956. Paper.
- Snell* (B.), *Fleischer* (U.), *Mette* (H. J.) Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. 2. Lieferung: ἀεικής - αἰρέω. Pp. 162-351. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. Paper, DM. 24.
- Snell* (B.) Festschrift Bruno Snell zum 60. Geburtstag am 18 Juni 1956 von Freunden und Schülern überreicht. Pp. vii+257. Munich: Beck, 1956. Paper, DM. 24.
- Thompson* (Stith) Motif-Index of Folk-Literature. Revised and enlarged edition. Volume 2 (D. Magic, E. The Dead.) Pp. 517. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger), 1956. Cloth.
- Tilley* (B.) The Story of Camilla. (From Aeneid vii and xi.) With introduction, notes, and vocabulary. (Cambridge Elementary Classics.) Pp. xix+136; 8 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. Cloth, 6s.
- Turner* (P.) Longus: Daphnis and Chloe. A new translation. Pp. 125. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Valgiglio* (E.) Plutarco: Vita di Mario. Introduzione, testo e commento. Pp. xxviii+223. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956. Paper, L. 800.

- Valgiglio* (E.) *Achille eroe implacibile*. Studio psicologico sull' Iliade. Pp. 125. Turin: Ruata, 1956. Paper, L. 750.
- van Berchem* (D.) *Le martyre de la Légion Thébaine*. Essai sur la formation d'une légende. (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 8.) Pp. vii+64. Basel: Reinhardt, 1956. Paper, 7.50 Sw. fr.
- Van Camp* (J.), *Canart* (P.) *Le sens du mot θεῖος chez Platon*. (Université de Louvain, Rec. de Trav. d'Histoire et de Philologie, 4e ser., fasc. 9.) Pp. 451. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1956. Paper, 375 B. fr.
- Vellacott* (P.) *Aeschylus: The Oresteian Trilogy*. A new translation. Pp. 201. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1956. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Vermeulen* (A. J.) *The Semantic Development of Gloria in Early-Christian Latin*. (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. 12.) Pp. xxii+236; 8 plates. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1956. Paper, fl. 12.50.
- Vourveris* (K. I.) *Παιδιά και Παιδεία: Σωκράτης - Πλάτων - Αριστοτέλης*. (From 'Επιστημονική Έπετηρίς, 1955-6.) Pp. 64. Athens, 1956.
- Wagenvoort* (H.) *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*. Pp. ix+316. Leiden: Brill, 1956. Cloth, fl. 30.
- Wallinga* (H. T.) *The Boarding-Bridge of the Romans: its Construction and its Function in the Naval Tactics of the First Punic War*. Pp. 96; 2 plates, 12 figs. The Hague: Nijhoff (London: Batsford), fl. 8.90.
- Way* (A. S.) *Euripides: Plays*. Translated into English verse. (Everyman's Library.) 2 vols. Pp. xiii+380; 370. London: Dent, 1956. Cloth, 7s. net each.
- Webster* (T. B. L.) *Greek Theatre Production*. Pp. xv+206; 24 plates. London: Methuen, 1956. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Wentker* (H.) *Sizilien und Athen*. Die Begegnung der attischen Macht mit den Westgriechen. Pp. 198. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1956. Paper, DM. 12.
- Westerink* (L. G.) *Olympiodorus: Commentary on the First Alcibiades of Plato*. Critical text and indexes. Pp. xiv+191. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co., 1956. Cloth, fl. 22.50.
- Whiteley* (J. L.) *Caesar: Gallic War*, Book vii. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary. (Modern School Classics.) Pp. xlv+242; ill., maps. London: Macmillan, 1956. Cloth, 6s.
- Wiseman* (F. J.) *Roman Spain*. Pp. viii+232; 16 plates. London: Bell, 1956. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.
- Wolfson* (H. A.) *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers: Faith—Trinity—Incarnation*. Pp. xxviii+635. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Cloth, 80s. net.
- Woodhead* (A. G.) *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Volumen xiii. Pp. xv+186. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1956. Paper, fl. 36.

A
al
A

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

A

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

B

INDEX

I. GENERAL INDEX

- Abel's *Die Plautusprologe*, 240
abrupto sidere, 104
Ackrill (J. L.) on Huber-Abrahamowicz's *Das Problem der Kunst bei Platon*, 164
Allan (D. J.) on Ross's *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*, 224
 Allen-Italie's *Concordance to Euripides*, 107
 Amatucci's *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana* 2nd edition, 249
 American School at Athens's *The Athenian Agora, guide to excavations*, 78
 Andrew and Oakley's *Homer's Iliad*, 299
 Archaeology, International Congress of (1957), 324
Arctos, new series of, 323
Aristoteles Latinus, Codices (II), 305
 Armstrong's *Robert Estienne*, 63
 Aurelianus's *De Verhouding van Godsdienst en Ethiek in Homerus*, 162
 Aymard-Auboyer's *Rome et son empire*, 155
 Bagnani's *Arbiter of Elegance*, 45
Baldry (H. C.) on Allen-Italie's *Concordance to Euripides*, 107; on Lattimore, Warner, Gladstone, and Grene's *Euripides, Four Tragedies*, 300
Balsdon (J. P. V. D.) on Crook's *Consilium Principis*, 149; on Starr's *Civilization and the Caesars*, 283; on Ehrenberg and Jones's *Documents illustrating the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* 2nd edition, 285
 Barbotin's *La théorie aristotélicienne de l'intellect d'après Théophraste*, 121
 Bayet and Baillet's *Tite-Live V*, 42
 Baynes's *Byzantine Studies*, 158
 Beare's *The Roman Stage* 2nd edition, 169
Beattie (A. J.) Pindar *Ol.* 6 82 f., 1; A note on Alcaeus fr. 129; 189; on Kalléris's *Les Anciens Macédoniens*, 64
 Beazley's *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* (II), 141
 Becatti's *I Mitrei*, 77
 Becker's *Tertullian, Apologeticum and Tertulians Apologeticum*, 175
Bell (H. I.) on *Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek*, 168
 Bennett's *The Pylus Tablets*, 269
Bibliographie Critique de la Statistique Linguistique, 322
 Bibliography of Classical Studies in Spain, 322
 Bieber's *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, 275
 Blaise's *Manuel du latin chrétien*, 177
 Bluck's *Plato's Phaedo*, 221
 Bluemel's *Greek Sculptors at Work*, 313
 Bodin-de Romilly's *Thucydide VI et VII*, 218
 Bolgar's *The Classical Heritage*, 59
 Boman's *Das hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem griechischen*, 81
 Bonavia-Hunt's *Horace the Minstrel*, 33
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 87, 186, 324
Borthwick (E. K.) on Lasserre's *Plutarque, De la Musique*, 122; on Eitrem, Amundsen, and Winnington-Ingram's *Fragments of Unknown Greek Tragic Texts with Musical Notation*, 211
 Bottiglioni's *Manuale dei dialetti italici*, 137
 Bowra's *Homer and his Forerunners*, 205
Boyd (M. J.) on Schilling's *La religion romaine de Vénus*, 266
Bradley (D. R.) on Lundström's *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen*, 250
 Brittain's *Latin in Church*, 184
 Broecker's *Animadversiones ad Plutarchi libellum περὶ εὐδαιμονίας*, 71
 Broncer's *Corinth* (I iv), 181
 Browne's *British Latin Selections*, 177
Browning (R.) on Verdière's *T. Calpurnii Siculi De laude Pisonis*, 34; on Schmeck's *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis*, 44; on Bagnani's *Arbiter of Elegance*, 45; on Grant's *Roman Literature*, 47; on Blaise's *Manuel du latin chrétien*, 177; on Malcovati's *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*, 244; on Vossler-Schmeck's *Einführung ins Vulgärlatein und Schmeck's Aufgaben und Methoden der modernen vulgärlateinischen Forschung*, 252
 Brugnoli's *Sulle possibilità di una ricostruzione dei 'Prata'*, 73
Brunt (P. A.) on Aymard-Auboyer's *Rome et son empire*, 155
Bryan-Brown (A. N.) on Navarre's *Démosthène, Plaidoyers politiques* (I), 117
 Budé Texts: Demosthenes, *Political Speeches* (I), 117; Demosthenes, *Private Speeches* (I), 28; Herodotus, *Book IX*, 23; Livy, *Book V*, 42; Panegyrici Latini (III), 308; Pliny, *Natural History IX*, 247; Sophocles (I), 105; Thucydides, *Books VI and VII*, 218
 Butcher's *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* reprinted, 166
 Caley's *Chemical Composition of Parthian Coins*, 314
 Caplan's *Ad Herennium*, 133
Chadwick (H.) on Sparks's *Apocalypsis Johannis*, 74
Chadwick (J.) on Bennett's *The Pylus Tablets*, 269
Charlton (J. M. T.) on Armstrong's *Robert Estienne*, 63
 Chase and Phillips's *New Greek Reader*, 297
 Claghorn's *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Timaeus*, 71
 coins, 54 ff., 82, 314 f.
 Collart's *Varron, De Lingua Latina V*, and *Varron grammairien latin*, 38
Commentationes in honorem Edwin Linkomies sexagenarii editae, 317
Cook (R. M.) on the American School at Athens's *The Athenian Agora, guide to*

- excavations, 78; on the Ures' *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, *University of Reading*, 79; on Broneer's *Corinth* (I iv), 181; on Bieber's *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age*, 275; on Bluemel's *Greek Sculptors at Work*, 313; on Lehmann's *Samothrace*, 315
- Corbett (P. E.)** on Beazley's *Attic Vase Paintings in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* (II), 141
- Cormack (J. M. R.)** on Kanatsulis's *Μακεδονική Προσωπογραφία*, 312
- Coxon (A. H.)** on Lucas's *Greek Drama for Everyman*, 116
- Crawford's Papyri Michaelidae**, 234
- Crook (J.)** on Fortina's *L'Imperatore Tito*, 288
- Crook's Consilium Principis**, 149
- Crusius-Rubenbauer's Römische Metrik**, 254
- Dahlmann's Der Bienenstaat in Vergils Georgica**, 170
- Dain-Mazon's Sophocle** (I), 105
- Dale (A. M.)** on Dain-Mazon's *Sophocle* (I), 105
- D'Anna's Le idee letterarie di Suetonio**, 72
- Davison (J. A.)** on Snell and Mette's *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (I), 8; on Stanford's *The Ulysses Theme*, 9; on Lobel and Roberts's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (XXII), 12; on *Thesaurismata*, 66; on Aurelianus's *De Verhouding van Godsdienst en Ethiek in Homerus*, 162; on Suys-Reitsma's *Het homerisch Epos*, Bowra's *Homer and his Forerunners*, and Pocock's *The Landfalls of Odysseus*, 205; on Stella's *Il Poema d'Ulisse*, and Page's *The Homeric Odyssey*, 207; on Andrew and Oakley's *Homer's Iliad*, 299
- de Falco's Demade**, 27
- Degrassi's Fasti Capitolini**, 147; his *Il confine nord-orientale dell'Italia romana*, 151
- della Corte's Varrone**, 36
- de Meyier's Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis, Codices Manuscripti** (VI), 306
- Den Boer's Laconian Studies**, 277
- Denniston's The Greek Particles** 2nd edition, 125
- Deonna's Deux études de symbolisme religieux**, 180; his *De Téléphore au 'moine bourru'*, 313
- de Saint-Denis's Pline l'Ancien, Histoire naturelle, livre IX**, 247
- Devreesse's Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs**, 168
- Dilke's Horace, Epistles I**, 171
- Diller's Die Bakchen**, 301
- Douglas (A. E.)** on Caplan's *Ad Herennium*, 133
- Dover (K. J.)** on Bodin-de Romilly's *Thucydide VI et VII*, 218
- Drioton, Demargne, des Places, and Fabre's Histoire des religions** (III), 261
- Droulers's Précis de la mythologie grecque et de la mythologie romaine**, 180
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers** (VIII), 183
- Ehrenberg and Jones's Documents illustrating the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius** 2nd edition, 285
- Eichholz (D. E.)** on de Saint-Denis's *Pline l'Ancien, Histoire naturelle, livre IX*, 247
- Eitrem, Amundsen, and Winnington-Ingram's Fragments of Unknown Greek Tragic Texts with Musical Notation**, 211
- Eos** summarized (XLVI 2), 185; (XLVIII 1), 316
- Eranos** summarized (LIII 1-2), 83; (LIII 3-4), 319
- Essays on Roman Coinage**, publication of, 323
- Evans (E.)** on Becker's *Tertullian, Apologeticum and Tertullians Apologeticum*, 175; on Säflund's *De Pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians*, 309
- Färber's Griechisches Unterrichtswerk, Grammatik** (I), *Übungsbuch* (I-III), *Wortkunde*, 297
- Fernández-Galiano's Jenofonte, Hieron**, 69; his *Lisias, Discursos I-XII*, 69
- Festschrift Bruno Snell**, 319
- Festschriften**, 316 ff., 323
- Festugière's Personal Religion among the Greeks**, 49
- Fitts's Lysistrata of Aristophanes**, 164
- Fordyce (C. J.)** on Spaeth's *Index verborum Ciceronis poeticorum fragmentorum*, 173
- Fortina's L'Imperatore Tito**, 288; his *L'Imperatore Graziano*, 290
- Fowler's Easy Selections from Vergil**, 296
- Fränkel's Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens**, 202
- Frassinetti's Fabularum Atellanarum Fragmenta**, 239
- Frisk's Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch** (I-III), 236
- Fuchs-Müller's Aurelianus Augustinus, Soliloquia**, 73
- Funaioli (G.)**, *Festschrift for*, 318
- Furley (D. J.)** on Ross's *Aristotle, Parva Naturalia*, 225
- Gagé's Apollon romain**, 265
- Galiano, Adrados, and Lasso de la Vega's El Concepto del Hombre en la Antigua Grecia**, 306
- Galletier's Panegyriques latins** (III), 308
- Garza's Alcmene, I Frammenti**, 68; his *Euripide, Ecuba*, 302
- Gernet's Démosthène, Plaidoyers civils** (I), 28
- Giomini's Appendix Vergiliana**, 170
- Godel's Socrate et Diotime**, 304
- Gold Mountains**, 2 f.
- Gomane (A. W.)** on Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker IIIb* (Supp.), 24; on Meyer's *Die Urkunden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 220
- Gordon's Potitus Valerius Messalla**, 181
- Gow (A. S. F.) Mnasilces**, 91
- Grant's Roman Literature**, 47; his *Roman Imperial Money*, 54
- Greenslade (S. L.)** on Fuchs-Müller's *Aurelianus Augustinus, Soliloquia*, 73
- Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek**, 168
- Griffiths (J. Gwyn) Plutarch, Moralia** 351 f., 103
- Gussen's Het Leven in Alexandrië**, 311
- Guthrie (W. K. C.)** on Festugière's *Personal Religion among the Greeks*, 49; on

- Pettazzoni's *Essays on the History of Religions*, 139; on Moulinier's *Orphée*, 262
- Haarhoff (T. J.)** *Hyacinthus* again, 200
(H)abronichos, 199
Hadas's *Ancilla to Classical Reading*, 160
- Hammond (N. G. L.)** on Kirsten and Kraiker's *Griechenlandkunde*, 293
- Handley (E. W.)** on Frassinetti's *Fabularum Atellanarum Fragmenta*, 239; on Abel's *Die Plautusprologe*, 240
- Hanson (R. P. C.)** on Boman's *Das hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem griechischen*, 81
- Hardie's** *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, 31
- Harrison (A. R. W.)** on Larsen's *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, 279
Harrison's *The Athenian Agora* (I), 56
Histoire de la Philosophie et Métaphysique, 304
Holwerda's *Commentatio de vocis quae est φῶς vi atque usu*, 228
Homages à Max Niedermann, 317
- Hopper (R. J.)** on Den Boer's *Laconian Studies*, 277
- Huber-Abrahamowicz's *Das Problem der Kunst bei Platon*, 164
- Hudson-Williams (H. Ll.)** on de Falco's *Demade*, 27; on Fernández-Galiano's *Jenofonte*, Hieron, 69; on Thesleff's *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek*, 128; on Hadas's *Ancilla to Classical Reading*, 160
- Hunningher's *The Origin of the Theater*, 316
hyacinthus, 200
- immunis*, 4
- Innes's *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*, 308
- Jackson's *Marginalia Scaenica*, 112
- Jacoby (F.), *Festschrift* for, 318
- Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIIb (Supp.), 24
- Jax (K.), *Festschrift* for, 318
- Jens's *Die Stichomythie in der frühen griechischen Tragödie*, 213
- Jones (A. H. M.)** on Kahrstedt's *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit*, 52
- Jones (D. M.)** *Otior*, 198; on Ruipérez's *Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo*, 126; on Bottiglion's *Manuale dei dialetti italici*, 137; on Sandmann's *Subject and Predicate*, 184; on Frisk's *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 236
- Jones (D. Mervyn)** on Strömberg's *Greek Proverbs*, 72; on Prato's *Euripide nella critica di Aristofane*, 163; on Fitts's *Lysistrata of Aristophanes*, 164; on Lévêque's *Agathon*, 215; on Hunningher's *The Origin of the Theater*, 316
- Kahrstedt's *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit*, 52
- Kallérís's *Les Anciens Macédoniens* (I), 64
- Kanatsulis's *Μακεδονική Προσωπογραφία*, 312
- Kapp (I.), *Festschrift* for, 66
- Katz's *The Decline of Rome and the Rise of Mediaeval Europe*, 291
- Kells (J. H.)** on Gernet's *Démosthène, Plaidoyers civils* (I), 28
- Kemball-Cook (B. H.)** on some school books, 296
- Kenner's *Das Theater und der Realismus in der griechischen Kunst*, 272
- Kenney (E. J.)** on Hardie's *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, 31; on Giomini's *Appendix Vergiliana*, 170
- Kerferd (G. B.)** on Claghorn's *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Timaeus*, 71; on Barbotin's *La théorie aristotélicienne de l'intellect d'après Théophraste*, 121; on Thomson's *Studies in Ancient Greek Society* (II), 255; on Mason's *Socrates*, 303; on Godel's *Socrate et Diotime*, 304; on *Histoire de la Philosophie et Métaphysique*, 304
- Kirk (G. S.)** A passage in *De Plantis*, 5
Kirk's *Heraclitus, The Cosmic Fragments*, 20
Kirsten and Kraiker's *Griechenlandkunde*, 293
Klaffenbach's *Die Astynomeninschrift von Pergamon*, 79
- Kraay (C. M.)** on Vermeule's *Some Notes on Ancient Dies*, 82; on Caley's *Chemical Composition of Parthian Coins*, 314; on Kraft's *Der goldene Kranz Caesars*, 315
Kraft's *Der goldene Kranz Caesars*, 315
Κώκλος, Sicilian journal, 322
- Lake and Porter's *Aeneas Triumphant*, 297
- Langosch's *Hymnen und Vaganenlieder*, 77
- Larsen's *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*, 279
- Lasserre's *Plutarque, De la Musique*, 122
- Lattimore, Warner, Gladstone, and Grene's *Euripides, Four Tragedies*, 300
- Laughton (E.)** Juvenal's other elephants, 201; on delle Corte's *Varrone*, 36; on Collart's *Varron, De Lingua Latina V*, and Varron *grammairien latin*, 38
- Lee (A. G.)** on Munari's *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores*, 172; on Watts's *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*, 172; on Innes's *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*, 308
- Lee's *Plato, The Republic*, 303
- Legrand's *Hérodote IX*, 23
- Lehmann's *Samothrace*, 315
- Lévêque's *Agathon*, 215
- Lightfoot's *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura V*, 297
- Linear B script, 269
- Linkomies (E.), *Festschrift* for, 317
- Lobel and Roberts's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (XXII), 12
- Loeb Classical Library: [Cicero] *Ad Herennium*, 133
- Lord's *Structural Latin Course* (II), 297
- Lucas (D. W.)** on Pohlenz's *Die griechische Tragödie*, 14; on Norwood's *Essays on Euripidean Drama*, 17; on Schiassi's *Sofocle, Le Trachiniae*, 163; on te Riele's *Les Femmes chez Eschyle*, 300; on Garzya's *Euripide, Ecuba*, 302
- Lucas's *Greek Drama for Everyman*, 116
- Lundström's *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen*, 250
- Maas (P.)** How Antileon's Tyranny ended, 200

- McDonald (A. H.)** on Bayet and Baillet's *Tite-Live V*, 42
- McGann (M. J.)** A Matter of Taste in Horace, 97
- Maguinness (W. S.)** on Stout's *Scribe and Critic at work in Pliny's Letters*, 173; on Galletier's *Panegyriques latins* (III), 308
- Malcolm (D. A.)** on Pabón's *Sallustio* (I), 41; on Sangiacomo's *Sallustio*, 136; on Vretska's *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*, 242
- Malcovati's *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*, 244
- Mason's *Socrates*, 303
- Mattingly (H.), *Festschrift* for, 323
- Meiggs (R.)** on Becatti's *I Mitrei*, 77
- Merkelbach's *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans*, 51
- Mette's *Ius civile in artem reductum*, 75
- Meyer's *Die Urkunden im Geschichtswerk des Thukydides*, 220
- Mikkola's *Isokrates*, 165
- milling machinery, Vitruvius' description of 193 ff.
- Millor and Butler's *The Letters of John of Salisbury* (I), 295
- Minio-Paluello's *Aristoteles Latinus* (IV 3), 166
- Mnemosyne* summarized (4th S. VIII 3-4), 83; (IX 1-2), 320
- Moricca's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad Q.F. libri, ad M. Brutum liber*, 245
- Moritz (L. A.)** Vitruvius' Water-mill, 193
- Morrison (J. S.)** *Airs, Waters, Places* 16; 102
- Morse (C. J.)** *Quid do ut (ne)*, 196
- Moulinier's *Orphée*, 262
- Munari's *P. Ovidi Nasonis Amores*, 172; his *M. Valerii Bucolica*, 311
- murus*, 4
- Nash-Williams's *Aeschylus, The Story of Orestes*, 296
- Natalicium Carolo Jax septuagenario oblatum*, 318
- Navarre's *Démotène, Plaidoyers politiques* (I), 117
- Navicula Chiloniensis*, 318
- Nicholas (J. B. K. M.)** on Westermann and Schiller's *Apokrimata*, 179
- Niederländer's *Die Bereicherungshaftung im klassischen römischen Recht*, 74
- Niedermann (M.), *Studies in memory of*, 317
- Nilsson's *Die hellenistische Schule*, 257; his *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (I) 2nd edition, 259
- Norwood's *Essays on Euripidean Drama*, 17
- Oliver's *Niccolo Perotti's Version of the Enchiridion of Epictetus*, 178
- Opuscula Romana* (I), 182
- otior*, 198
- Otto's *The Homeric Gods*, 162
- Owens (E. E. L.)** *Ammianca*, 99
- Oxford Classical Texts: Aristotle, *Fragmenta Selecta*, 224; *Appendix Vergiliana* and *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae*, 31
- Pabón's *Sallustio* (I), 41
- Page (D. L.)** Greek Verses from the Eighth Century B.C., 95; ὑποκρίτης, 191; on Garzya's *Alcmane, I Frammenti*, 68
- Page's *The Homeric Odyssey*, 207
- papyri, 12 ff., 168, 211 ff., 230 ff., 233, 234 ff.
- Parthenon, paper on structural iron of, 86
- Pauly's *Realencyclopädie*, publication of Zweite Reihe XV of, 86; Supp. vol. VIII of, 323
- Pausias, paintings of, 97 ff.
- Pearson (L.)** on Merkelbach's *Die Quellen des griechischen Alexanderromans*, 51
- Perosa's *Michaelis Marulli Carmina*, 77
- Persarum montes*, 3
- Pertusi's *Scholía Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, 298
- Pettazzoni's *Essays on the History of Religions*, 139
- Phronesis*, publication of first number of, 87
- Piraino's *Antigona Dosone*, 80
- Platnauer (M.)** *Aeschylus, Persae* 647-8; 102; on Bonavia-Hunt's *Horace the Minstrel*, 33; on Jackson's *Marginalia Saecula*, 112; on Smutny's *The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus*, 216; on Crusius-Rubenbauer's *Römische Metrik*, 254
- Pocock's *The Landfalls of Odysseus*, 205
- Pohlentz's *Die griechische Tragödie*, 14
- Polacco's *Il volto di Tiberio*, 286
- Prato's *Euripide nella critica di Aristofane*, 163
- Prete's *Terenti Comoediae*, 129
- quadratum*, 6 f.
- quid do ut*, 196
- Raby (F. J. E.)** on Langosch's *Hymnen und Vagantlieder*, 77; on Amatucci's *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana*, 249; on Millor and Butler's *The Letters of John of Salisbury* (I), 295; on Munari's *M. Valerii Bucolica*, 311
- Rattenbury (R. M.)** on Devreesse's *Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs*, 168; on Vilborg's *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon*, 229
- Raubitschek (A. E.)** (H)abronichos, 199
- Rees (B. R.)** on Skeat's *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, 81; on Turner and Lenger's *The Hibehe Papyri* (II), 233; on Crawford's *Papyri Michaelidae*, 234
- Rees (D. A.)** Athenaeus viii 332 c: 199; on Minio-Paluello's *Aristoteles Latinus* (IV 3), 166; on *Aristoteles Latinus, Codices* (II), 305
- Revue de Philologie* summarized (XXIX 2), 84; (XXX 1) 321
- Reynolds (J. M.)** on Degraffi's *Il confine nord-orientale dell' Italia romana*, 151; on Wheeler's *Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers*, 153; on Gordon's *Potius Valerius Messalla*, 181; on *Opuscula Romana* (I), 182
- Rheinisches Museum* summarized (XCVIII 3), 84; (XCVIII 4), 185; (XCIX 1), 321
- Richter's *Greek Portraits*, 143
- Rivista di Filologia* summarized (XXXIII 3), 84; (XXXIII 4), 185
- Robertson (D. S.)** on Terzaghi-Carlesi's *Apuleio, Le Metamorfosi*, 175
- Rose (H. J.)** Lucretius ii 778-83: 6; on Wilhelm-Hooijbergh's *Peccatum*, 76; on Otto's *The Homeric Gods*, 162; on Swahn's *The Tale of Cupid and Psyche*, 175; on Deonna's *Deux études de symbolisme religieux*, 180; on Droulers's *Précis de mythologie*

- grecque et de mythologie romaine, 180; on Vollgraf's *Une inscription gravée sur un vase cultuel mithraïque*, 183; on Nilsson's *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (I) 2nd edition, 259; on Drioton, Demargne, des Places, and Fabre's *Histoire des religions* (III), 261; on Gagé's *Apollon romain*, 265; on Viljoen's *Pindaros se tiende en elfde Olympische odes*, 299; on Stégen's *Étude sur cinq Bucoliques de Virgile*, 307; on Deonna's *De Téléphore au 'moine bourru'*, 313
- Rose and others' *La Notion du divin*, 119
- Ross's *Aristotelis Fragmenta Selecta*, 224; his *Aristotle, Parva Naturalia*, 225
- Ruipérez's *Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo*, 126
- Runciman (S.) on Baynes's *Byzantine Studies*, 158; on Dumbarton Oaks Papers (VIII), 183
- Russell (D. A.) on Stark's *Philologische Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der Aristotelischen Ethik*, 70; on Thomson's *The Ethics of Aristotle*, 167; on Lee's *Plato, The Republic*, 303; on Westman's *Plutarch gegen Kolotes*, 305
- Säflund's *De Pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians*, 309
- Salač (A.), *Festschrift for*, 87
- Sandbach (F. H.) on Broecker's *Animadversiones ad Plutarchi libellum nepi εὐθυίας*, 71
- Sandmann's *Subject and Predicate*, 184
- Sangiaco's *Sallustio*, 136
- Schiassi's *Sofocle, Le Trachiniae*, 163
- Schilling's *La religion romaine de Vénus*, 266
- Schmeck's *Petronei Cena Trimalchionis*, 44; his *Aufgaben und Methoden der modernen vulgärlateinischen Forschung*, 252
- school books, 296
- Scripta Hierosolymitana (I), 67
- Scullard (H. H.) on van den Bruwaene's *La société romaine* (I), 146
- Semple (W. H.) on Browne's *British Latin Selections*, 177
- Sicily, study of ancient history of, 322
- sidus, 104
- Sinclair (T. A.) on Pertusi's *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, 298
- Skeat's *The Reigns of the Ptolemies*, 81
- Skutsch (O.) on Prete's *Terenti Comoediae*, 129
- Smith (W. K.) on D'Anna's *Le idee letterarie di Suetonio*, 72; on Brugnoli's *Sulle possibilità di una ricostruzione dei 'Prata'*, 73
- Smutny's *The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus*, 216
- Snell and Mette's *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (I), 8
- Snell (B.), *Festschrift for*, 319
- Spaeth's *Index verborum Ciceronis poeticorum fragmentorum*, 173
- Spain, Classical studies in, 322
- Sparks's *Apocalypsis Johannis*, 74
- Stanford's *The Ulysses Theme*, 9
- Stark's *Philologische Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der Aristotelischen Ethik*, 70
- Starr's *Civilization and the Caesars*, 283
- Stégen's *Étude sur cinq Bucoliques de Virgile*, 307
- Stella's *Il Poema d'Ulisse*, 207
- Stevens (P. T.) on Zuntz's *The Political Plays of Euripides*, 109; on Jens's *Die Stichomythie in der frühen griechischen Tragödie*, 213; on Diller's *Die Bakchen*, 301
- stomachion, 7
- Stout's *Scribe and Critic at work in Pliny's Letters*, 173
- Strömberg's *Greek Proverbs*, 72
- Studia Antiqua, 87
- Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion, publication of, 323
- Studi in onore di Gino Funaioli, 318
- subigere, 195
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 82, 185, 319
- Sutherland (C. H. V.) on Grant's *Roman Imperial Money*, 54
- Suys-Reitsma's *Het homerisch Epos*, 205
- Swahn's *The Tale of Cupid and Psyche*, 175
- Symbolae Osloenses summarized (XXXI), 85; (XXXII), 321
- Symbolae Raphaelli Taubenschlag dedicatae, 316
- Tate (J.) on Kirk's *Heraclitus, The Cosmic Fragments*, 20; on Bolgar's *The Classical Heritage*, 59; on Fernández-Galiano's *Lisias, Discursos I-XII*, 69; on *La Notion du divin*, 119; on Denniston's *The Greek Particles* 2nd edition, 125; on Mikkola's *Isokrates*, 165; on Butcher's *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art* reprinted, 166; on Zucker's *Isocrates' Panathenaios*, 166; on Fränkel's *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, 202; on Bluck's *Plato's Phaedo*, 221; on Holwerda's *Commentatio de vocis quae est φῶς vi atque usu*, 228; on van Litsenburg's *God en het goddelijke in de dialogen van Plato*, 302; on Galiano, Adrados, and Lasso de la Vega's *El Concepto del Hombre en la Antigua Grecia*, 306
- Taubenschlag (R.), *Festschrift for*, 316
- Ténékidès's *La notion juridique d'indépendance et la tradition hellénique*, 144
- te Riele's *Les Femmes chez Eschyle*, 300
- Terzaghi-Carlesi's *Apuleio, Le Metamorfosi*, 175
- Thesaurismata, 66
- Thesleff's *Studies on Identification in Early and Classical Greek*, 128
- Thomas (J. A. C.) on Niederländer's *Die Bereicherungshafung im klassischen römischen Recht*, 74; on Mette's *Ius civile in artem reductum*, 75
- Thomson (J. O.) *The Gold Mountains*, 2
- Thomson's (G.) *Studies in Ancient Greek Society* (II), 255
- Thomson's (J. A. K.) *The Ethics of Aristotle*, 167
- Toynbee (J. M. C.) on Harrison's *The Athenian Agora* (I), 56; on Richter's *Greek Portraits*, 143; on Polacco's *Il volto di Tiberio*, 286
- Transactions of the American Philological Association summarized (LXXXV), 85
- Tredennick (H.) on Beare's *The Roman Stage* 2nd edition, 169
- Treloar (A.) *Horace, Odes iii 23 17-20: 4*
- Turner (E. G.) on Gussen's *Het Leven in Alexandrië*, 311

Turner and Lenger's *The Hibe Papyri* (II), 233

Ullman's *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 310
Ures' *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, University of Reading, 79

van den Bruwaene's *La société romaine* (I), 146
van Litsenburg's *God en het goddelijke in de dialogen van Plato*, 302

Verdière's *T. Calpurnii Siculi De laude Pisonis*, 34

Vermeule's *Some Notes on Ancient Dies*, 82

Vilborg's *Achilles Tatiuss, Leucippe and Clitophon*, 229

Viljoen's *Pindaros se tiende en elfde Olympiese odes*, 299

Vollgraff's *Une inscription gravée sur un vase cultuel mithraïque*, 183

Vossler-Schmeck's *Einführung ins Vulgärlatein*, 252

Vretska's *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*, 242

Wagenvoort (H.), publication of some papers of, 323

Walbank (F. W.) on Katz's *The Decline of Rome and the Rise of Mediaeval Europe*, 291

Warmington (B. H.) on Fortina's *L'Imperatore Graziano*, 290

Watt (W. S.) on Dilke's *Horace, Epistles I*, 171; on Moricca's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad Q.F. libri, ad M. Brutum liber*, 245

Watts's *The Metamorphoses of Ovid*, 172

Webster (T. B. L.) on Kenner's *Das Theater und der Realismus in der griechischen Kunst*, 272

Weiss (R.) on Ullman's *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*, 310

Westermann and Schiller's *Apokrimata*, 179

Westlake (H. D.) on Ténékidès's *La notion juridique d'indépendance et la tradition hellénique*, 144

Westman's *Plutarch gegen Kolotes*, 305

Wheeler's *Rome beyond the Imperial Frontiers*, 153

Whiteley's *Virgil, Aeneid, V*, 296

Whittick (G. C.) Tacitus, *Annals* i 28: 7; on Legrand's *Hérodote IX*, 23

Wilhelm-Hooijbergh's *Peccatum*, 76

Williams (R. D.) Virgil, *Aeneid* xii 451: 104; on Dahlmann's *Der Bienenstaat in Vergils Georgica*, 170

Woodhead (A. G.) on Degraffi's *Fasti Capitolini*, 147; on Nilsson's *Die hellenistische Schule*, 257

Woodhead (G.) on Scripta Hierosolymitana (I), 67; on Klaffenbach's *Die Astynomeninschrift von Pergamon*, 79; on Piraino's *Antigono Dosone*, 80

Young (D. C. C.) on Langosch's *Michaelis Marulli Carmina*, 77; on Oliver's *Niccolò Peretti's Version of the Enchiridion of Epictetus*, 178; on de Meyier's *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis, Codices Manuscripti* (VI), 306

Zucker's *Isokrates' Panathenaios*, 166

Zuntz's *The Political Plays of Euripides*, 109

II. INDEX LOCORUM

Note.—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given place.

Aelian *NA* iv 27: 3; vi 19: 92

Aeschylus *Pers.* 647-8: 102. *PV* 313: 2. fr. 44: 6

Alcaeus fr. 129 = G i 5-9 (Lobel-Page): 189 ff; P 2 a 8 (L-P): 200; fr. 39 = Z 23 (L-P): 93; Z 24 1-2 (L-P): 191

Alexis fr. 15 12: 92

Ammianus Marcellinus passim: 100 ff.

Anth. lyr. gr., carm. pop. 24 B Diehl: 191

Anth. Pal. iv 1 29: 91; v 226: 94; vii 54, 171: 92; vii 189-215 passim: 91-94; vii 364: 92-93; vii 437: 91; vii 475, 545: 92; ix 144: 94; ix 324: 92; ix 333: 93; ix 432: 92; ix 524 19: 191; xi 243: 95; xii 138: 92, 95

App. Anth. iii 71: 92

Apuleius *Met.* viii 4, x 5: 100

Archilochus fr. 21: 94

Aristophanes *Av.* 1151: 94. *V.* 1279: 192

Aristotle *GA* 716^a15: 6. *HA* 535^b7, 12: 93; 550^b32, 556^a8: 92; 581^a14: 6. *Plant.* 817^a23: 5. *Pol.* 1316^a29: 200

Arrian *Anab.* v 4 3: 3

Athenaeus viii 332 c: 199; xiii 567 b: 98

Augustine in *Psalm.* 142 10: 197

Ausonius xvii 208 Peiper: 7

Cato *Agr.* 18 7, 74, 76 1: 195

Catullus iii 11: 92; iv 9, 18, xxix 4: 5

Censorinus v 3, vi 4: 6

Cicero *Ac.* ii 89: 101. *Agr.* ii 57: 101. *de Or.* ii 280: 199. *Fam.* iii 8 3: 198; xi 10 5: 2.

Leg. ii 45: 195. *Off.* ii 19: 101; iii 58: 198.

Par. v 37: 99. *Verr.* ii 1 101, 5 118: 197

Ctesias *Ind.* 12: 3

Demetrius *Eloc.* 76: 98

Demosthenes xiv 24: 95

Dio xlix 1 5: 199

Dioscorides *MM* ii 85 Wellmann: 195

Edict. Diocl. xv 54: 193

Festus p. 307 Müller: 195

Fr. Trag. Adesp. 423: 2

Fronto i 131 van den Hout: 98

Gaius *Inst.* iii 90: 196

Herodotus iii 116, iv 13, 25, 27: 3

Hesiod *Op.* 584: 93; 618: 95

Hippocrates *Aër.* 16: 102

Homer *Il.* i 409: 92; iii 446: 96; iv 275 f.: 104; iv 487: 94; viii 232: 94; xxiii 879: 190. *Od.* ii 431: 94; iii 377: 189; xxiv 10: 92; xxiv 55: 189

Horace *C.* i 28 18: 4; iii 5 17: 5; iii 23 17-20, iv 12 23: 4. *Ep.* i 14 33: 4. *S.* i 3 138 f.: 99; i 6 128: 198 f.; ii 2 43: 4; ii 7 passim: 97 ff.

JG i² 717: 200; vii 395: 91; xiv 1934 f.: 93
lin. [*Silv.*] 34: 197

Josephus *BJ* iv 611: 201

Justin i 9 14: 101

Juvenal iii 183-9, vii 165-6: 196 f.; x 50, 148-50, 171, xi 124: 201

Livy iii 45 2, 63 10, xxi 19 3, xxxv 26 2, xli 23 5: 7

Lucian *Herm.* 71: 3. *Herod.* 4 f.: 99

Lucretius ii 778-83: 6 f.

Martial v 69 3: 5; xi 69: 92

Orph. Arg. 333: 93

Ovid *AA* i 724: 104. *Am.* ii 17 30: 197. *F.* ii 495: 104. *M.* i 424, v 281 f.: 104; x 211 f.: 200; xi 31: 195; xiii 394-5: 200

Pausanias ii 27 3: 98

Persius iii 65: 3

Pindar *I.* v 52, vi 73: 2. *N.* vii 71-72: 2. *O.* vi 82 ff., x 21-22: 1 f.; i. 97, ix 34: 92. *P.* i 86: 2. fr. 140^b Snell: 191

Plato *Lg.* 830 b, 845 d: 95. *Pol.* 262 a: 95

Plautus *Aul.* 701-2: 3. *Stich.* 24-25: 3

Pliny *NH* praef. 11: 5; ii 43, 55: 7; vii 10, x 40: 3; xi 267: 93; xvii 111, xviii 105, xxii 127: 195; xxv 14: 3; xxx 49: 92;

xxxiii 134: 3; xxxv 78: 99; xxxv 126 f.: 98
Plutarch *Mor.* 351-82 passim, 1117 d-e: 103

Rufius Festus *Brev.* 13: 101

Sallust *C.* 23: 3

Seneca *Contr.* vii 2 1, ix 3 11-12: 196 f.

Seneca *Ben.* iv 11 1: 196. *Ep.* lxxix 5: 197;

lxxxv: 4; xc 23: 195. *Herc. Fur.* 216: 4

Silius vi 608: 104

Sophocles *Aj.* 584: 2. *Ant.* 85: 190; 807: 92.

El. 895: 94. *OT* 83: 94. *Phil.* 572: 102.

Trach. 874: 92

Statius *Th.* i 325, ii 184: 104

Strabo xii 566: 193; xiii 617: 94

Tacitus *A.* i 28: 7; ii 61: 201. *H.* i 39: 101; ii 1 2, 5: 100

Terence *Phorm.* 68: 3; 633: 196

Themistocles *Ep. Cr.* Hercher p. 743 lines 1,

3, 19, 47, p. 751 lines 4, 5: 199

Theocritus iv 26, xxv 271: 92

Theophrastus *CP* iv 5 6: 103

Thucydides iv 25 4: 199

Valerius Maximus i 8 6, iii 2 ext. 3, vi 4 5, 9 ext. 7, vii 2 ext. 11, ix 8 2, 15 6: 101

Varro *Anthp.* fr. 36 Bücheler: 3. *RR* i 2 1: 198

Virgil *A.* i 742: 7; ii 416, iii 199, xi 259 f., xii

451: 104; xii 559: 4. *E.* iii 63, 106-7: 200.

G. i 125: 195; i 311: 104; ii 478: 7; iii 259:

104; iv 183: 200; iv 244: 4

[Virgil] *Meret.* 47: 195

Vitruvius iv 7 4: 195; x 5 2: 193

Vulgate *Gen.* xxxviii 16: 197

Xenophon *Anab.* v 6 15, vi 5 20: 94

III. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

ἄβρός, 199

ἀκόναι, 1 f.

ἀκρίς, 92 f.

ἀλίφραντος, 93

ἀποδημία, 103

ἀποκολυμβάν, 199

ἀποκυβιστάν, 199

ἀποκυμβάν, 199

ἄργιλος, 91 f.

ἀφύσσεσθαι, 94

δόξαν εἶχειν ἐπί, 1

ἐπονομάζειν, 190

ἔρροι, 96

ἐς τότε, 95

κατάσκιος, 94

κυβιστάν, 199

κύμβη, 199

ὀνομάζειν, 190

ὀνομαίνειν, 190

προσεννέπειν, 190

σύν (adverbial), 190

ὑποκριτής, 191 f.





The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

† T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. † W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

† E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, M.A. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

Each volume Foolscape 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement.*

NEW VOLUMES, 1956

LATIN

411 S. AUGUSTINE. *City of God*. Seven volumes, vol. I, Books I-III.
Translated by G. E. McCracken.

393 PLINY, NATURAL HISTORY. Ten volumes, Vol. VII, Books XXIV-XXVII. Translated by W. H. S. Jones.

GREEK

406 PLUTARCH. *Moralia*. 15 volumes, vol. XII. Translated by H. Cherniss and W. C. Helmbold.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

FONDATION HARDT

ENTRETIENS SUR L'ANTIQUITÉ CLASSIQUE

Volume II

L'INFLUENCE GRECQUE SUR LA POESIE LATINE DE CATULLE À OVIDE

SIX PAPERS WITH DISCUSSIONS

viii, 264 pages, cloth. £1. 15s.

JEAN BAYET: *Catulle, la Grèce et Rome*. AUGUSTO ROSTAGNI: *L'influenza greca sulle origini dell'elegia erotica latina*. VICTOR PÖSCHL: *Horaz*. FRIEDRICH KLINGNER: *Virgil*. PIERRE BOYANCÉ: *Properce*. L. P. WILKINSON: *Greek Influence on the Poetry of Ovid*. INDEX.

Of all booksellers

Agents for Great Britain and British Commonwealth

W. HEFFER & SONS, LTD., CAMBRIDGE

A GREEK GRAMMAR AND EXERCISES

by Prof. S. DAVIS

M.A. (Cantab.), D.Litt. (Witwatersrand)

This book has been written after many years' experience both as student and lecturer. Its aim is to provide both grammar and exercises. In the brief time allotted to the teaching of Greek it has been found that the essentials of Greek grammar and syntax must be learned—there is no short cut. Nevertheless, the material necessary for a foundation in the language can be presented clearly and lucidly. As will be seen from the arrangement of the sections of this book, two terms are postulated for a first-year university course. Schools, however, may sub-divide the subject matter so as to cover four or more terms. They will find the matter and the arrangement in this book eminently suitable for their purpose.
155 pages. *Price 21s. 0d.*

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL PRESS

P.O. BOX 375

PIETERMARITZBURG

SOUTH AFRICA

Studies in Ancient Greek Society. Volume Two

THE FIRST PHILOSOPHERS

GEORGE THOMSON

30s.

'I hope I have written enough to give something of the scope and quality of this great book. It is written to provoke controversy, and it does provoke it. Not only the first philosophers but philosophy itself can never be the same to anyone who has read it.'

J. D. Bernal, F.R.S.

'All in all, Professor Thomson's book is a mine of interesting ideas and stimulating thoughts, in which everyone should go and dig. He will long be remembered as the first of the European classicists to shake off the shackles of Europocentrism which has bound them till now, and to recognize in all humility the equality of the contributions of the ancient Chinese and Indian peoples.'

Joseph Needham, F.R.S.

This book, astringent, provocative, and intensely alive, is a creative work of scholarship, and a constant stimulus and challenge to the reader. Whether one accepts Professor Thomson's initial postulates or not, there is much to admire in the breadth of his knowledge, the incisiveness of his intellect, and the polish of his style.'

The Listener

LAWRENCE & WISHART

The Art of Greek Comedy

KATHERINE LEVER

A critical analysis of the comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, studied in the context of the history of comedy, of the allied arts, and of contemporary life. Before dealing with the great playwrights Dr. Lever examines the processes by which the diverse manifestations of the worship of Dionysos developed and fused into the complex literary form of Old Comedy. 21s.

Form and Meaning in Drama

H. D. F. KITTO

An analysis of six Greek tragedies—the Orestes trilogy, *Ajax*, *Antigone*, and *Philoctetes*—and *Hamlet*. Professor Kitto starts from the premiss that in any first-rate work of art, structure, and style are ultimately identical with meaning, so that it is useless to consider them separately. 30s.

Greek Theatre Production

T. B. L. WEBSTER

Scenery, staging, and costumes are treated chronologically within geographical areas, and the evidence is given for local productions in the Greek-speaking world from the 6th century B.C. onwards. In each period technique is related to the plays actually produced. Illustrated. 25s.

METHUEN & CO. LTD., 36 Essex Street, London, W.C. 2

A History of Education in Antiquity

By H. I. MARROU

Professor of Early Christian History at the Sorbonne

488 pp. 42s. net

'This masterpiece of educational history . . . he writes with admirable lucidity. The great learning on which the book is founded does not obtrude, being mainly tucked away in massive appendices, and Professor Marrou clearly has more than a nodding acquaintance with modern theories of education, so that he abounds in telling comparisons. He has been well translated by Mr. George Lamb and what has become a standard work for the classical historian should now find a place in every British educational library.'

The Times Educational Supplement

SHEED & WARD, LTD.

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

Studies in Ancient Greek Society, ii (Thomson), G. B. KERFERD, 255; *Die hellenistische Schule* (Nilsson), A. G. WOODHEAD, 257; *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, i (Nilsson), H. J. ROSE, 259; *Histoire des religions*, 3, H. J. ROSE, 261; *Orphée et l'orphisme* (Moulinier), W. K. C. GUTHRIE, 262; *Apollon romain* (Gagé), H. J. ROSE, 265; *La Religion romaine de Vénus* (Schilling), M. J. BOYD, 266; *The Pylas Tablets* (Bennett), J. CHADWICK, 269; *Das Theater und der Realismus in der griechischen Kunst* (Kenner), T. B. L. WEBSTER, 272; *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (Bieber), R. M. COOK, 275; *Laconian Studies* (den Boer), R. J. HOPPER, 277; *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History* (Larsen), A. R. W. HARRISON, 279; *Civilization and the Caesars* (Starr), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 283; *Documents illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Ehrenberg and Jones), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 285; *Il volto di Tiberio* (Polacco), J. M. C. TOYNBEE, 286; *L'Imperatore Tito* (Fortina), J. A. CROOK, 288; *L'Imperatore Graziano* (Fortina), B. H. WARMINGTON, 290; *The Decline of Rome* (Katz), F. W. WALBANK, 291; *Griechenlandkunde* (Kirsten, Kraiker), N. G. L. HAMMOND, 293; *The Letters of John of Salisbury* (Millor and Butler), F. J. E. RABY, 295; *Some School Books*, B. H. KEMBALL-COOK, 296.

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Short Reviews | 298 |
| Festschriften | 316 |
| Summaries of Periodicals | 319 |
| Notes and News | 322 |
| Books Received | 324 |
| Index | 327 |

The Publishers acknowledge with gratitude a generous grant from the British Academy towards the cost of this number

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Peter Symonds' School, Winchester. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology

GREEK PINS.

and their Connexions with Europe and Asia

PAUL JACOBSTHAL

Illustrated. £8. 8s. net

THE AMASIS PAINTER

SEMNI KAROUZOU

Illustrated. 75s. net

A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY
ON THUCYDIDES

Volumes II and III

The Ten Years War, Books II-V. 24

A. W. GOMME

Two volumes. 84s. net

A. PERSI FLACCI SATVRARVM
LIBER

Accedit Vita

Edited by WENDELL CLAUSEN

15s. net

FORMS OF ROMAN LEGISLATION

DAVID DAUBE

21s. net

A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY SCHOOL
BOOK

From a Manuscript in the British Museum

Edited by WILLIAM NELSON

25s. net

Oxford University Press

5910